

Mrs. Laura P. Hazelwood

Dec 5-1960

Mr. Allen Dulles -
Washington, D.C.

Executive Secretary
60-9853

Dear Mr. Dulles:-

I am sending you this book by Peter J. Desnoes, D.D., as well as many others, feel that any discussion of this question by so able a man is worthy of your consideration.

Sincerely,
Laura Hazelwood

H


	UNCLASSIFIED	CONFIDENTIAL	SECRET
--	--------------	--------------	--------

**CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP**

TO	NAME AND ADDRESS		INITIALS	DATE
1	Col. Grogan			12/27 REC
2	ER			
3				
4				
5				
6				
X	ACTION	DIRECT REPLY	PREPARE REPLY	
	APPROVAL	DISPATCH	RECOMMENDATION	
	COMMENT	FILE	RETURN	
	CONCURRENCE	X INFORMATION	SIGNATURE	

Remarks:

For your information and whatever action you may deem appropriate.



FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER		
FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.		DATE
[Redacted] st. to the DCI		12/23/60

Approved For Release 2002/08/21 : CIA-RDP80B01676R003600070077-4

\$1.50

CATHOLIC VICTORY IN 1960?

Peter J. Doesburg, D.D.

Approved For Release 2002/08/21 : CIA-RDP80B01676R003600070077-4

THE AUTHOR



PETER J. DOESWYCK

made his theological studies at the University of Freiburg, Switzerland (1926-1933), and was ordained a Roman Catholic priest for the Diocese of Omaha, Nebraska. In 1938 he resigned from the priesthood. For the past 25 years Peter Doeswyck has specialized in the studies of the Fathers, the Middle Ages and the History of the Church. Having read every available book written from the time of Christ till the Reformation, he is recognized as one of the greatest students of the original sources of the Middle Ages. He has contributed many articles to religious magazines and was granted an honorary degree of Doctor of Divinity by the Lighthouse Bible College in 1951. Through his hundreds of lectures on Church History he has gained national recognition.

**CATHOLIC VICTORY
IN 1960?**

BY

Peter J. Doeswyck, D.D.

Former Priest and Church Historian

Printed in the United States

First edition:

First printing, Aug. 3, 1959
Second Printing, Sept. 10, 1959
Third printing, Oct. 19, 1959
Fourth printing, Jan. 25, 1960
Fifth printing, April 22, 1960

Second edition:

First printing, July 15, 1960
Second printing, Sept. 15, 1960

Copyright 1959, 1960

by

Peter J. Doeswyck

PETER J. DOESWYCK, D.D.

P. O. Box 1651

Long Beach, Calif.

PREFACE

The constitutions of Catholic countries like Spain, Argentina, Paraguay, etc., require that the president or premier be of the Roman Catholic faith, thus disqualifying all Protestants, Jews and atheists. Constitutions of Protestant States often required the candidate for office to believe in the divinity of Christ, the inspiration of the Bible, etc. The constitution of Texas still requires belief in "a Supreme Being" (*Art. I, Section 4*). Because the United States has millions of good citizens who are of Jewish, Arab, Chinese and Japanese extraction, while millions of others have no religious affiliation at all, our Constitution has ruled that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office" (*Art. 6*).

The sixth article of our Constitution refers to the *candidate*, not to the *voter*. If it could be proved that the President of Argentina was of the Jewish faith, his election would be invalid and his authority illegal. If it could be proved that the President of the United States was of the Jewish faith, his election would remain valid. No religious test, creed or affiliation is required. As the sixth article does not refer to the *voter*, it could not imply that the voter may not examine and weigh the religious belief and philosophy of a candidate. Our Constitution does not regulate the personal likes and dislikes of the voter. The religious belief and philosophy of a candidate, such as his stand on freedom of religion, separation of Church and State, birth control, the overthrow of the government by force, etc., are far more important than his personality and many other qualifications which may have contributed to his election. If the Constitution forbade our votes to be influenced by religious issues, or by our religious preferences, it would not only mean that millions of votes have been invalid, but that the voter is no longer free to vote for the man of his choice. It would then be equally unconstitutional for Catholics to vote for a Catholic candidate because of his Catholic faith. The existence of a "Catholic vote", however, is a recognized fact.

We all know, for example, that the Mennonites are a nice and harmless group of Christians. Their religion holds that it is a sin to bear arms in defense of one's country. As the President

of the United States is the Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces and has the duty to protect our land against our enemies, there would be very few Protestants or Catholics who would vote a Mennonite into the White House. This is using good common sense. Those who would call this a case of bigotry and anti-Protestantism are maliciously confusing the issue.

We all know, for example, that the Jehovah Witnesses are a non-Catholic group who believe that it is a sin to salute the flag. Voters who do not like an American President who would be afraid to salute the American flag have the right to vote for someone other than a Jehovah Witness. Those who maintain that the raising of such a religious issue is unconstitutional are purposely misinterpreting our constitutional laws for selfish reasons.

We all know, for example, that the Roman Catholic religion differs from all other Christian faiths in that it has a hierarchy which opposes democracy and which rules dictatorially over its subjects. Rome uses anathemas and excommunications to force Catholic leaders to obey its commands. Because the Pope is the ruler of an independent State, and because every devout Catholic believes that it is a sin to disobey his commands, many non-Catholics hesitate to vote a subject of this foreign ruler into the highest office of the land. It is their constitutional right and privilege to cast their vote for the man of their own choice. To legislate the preferences and decisions of voters is to abolish democracy itself. To accuse the American voter (80% non-Catholic) of bigotry and anti-Catholicism is in itself an act of bigotry, of anti-Protestantism, if not anti-Americanism.

There are more Catholic representatives in Washington than of any other denomination. The local governments of our cities are predominantly Catholic. It is almost impossible for a Protestant to become mayor of such corrupt cities as Chicago. It becomes evident that Protestants will be called bigots until they have sold their birth rights one hundred per cent.

Non-Catholic presidents have been extremely cautious never to use the power and dignity of their office to further the cause of their particular creed. Many non-Catholic voters fear that a Catholic President could be made an agent to promote both the spiritual and political aims of Rome. Protestant groups, for

example, are struggling to hold their own in cases of mixed marriages (a totalitarian church has an advantage over a democratic one). A Catholic President would not only give Catholicism more prestige, but it would become more difficult for Protestant parents to convince their children not to forsake their own religion when marrying a Catholic. There is the fear that our newspapers would give in to the constant pressure of the Catholic press to show week after week the President not only worshipping in the Cathedral of Washington, but kneeling before his Cardinal and kissing his ring. The latter would create the false impression that the President is not the first citizen of the land. Whenever a Catholic President would have to make a difficult decision which enters the realm of conscience—such as to declare war or to use the atom bomb—he would have to confide State secrets to his confessor, i.e. to a member of the hierarchy. Under penalty of excommunication a Catholic President could be forced to declare war on certain nations, thus forcing American boys to fight the wars of the Vatican. The Roman hierarchy might pressure a Catholic President to appoint certain Catholics to his Cabinet, to pack the Supreme Court with Catholics, to re-interpret the Constitution, to advocate public funds for Catholic schools, to use the power of the White House and of Congressional Committees to oppose or vilify those who dare to fight for separation of Church and State. This book will examine the evidence on which such fears are founded.

Peter J. Doeswyck

C O N T E N T S

	page
Pope's Condemnation of Democracy	11
Bull "Immortale Dei"	13
Oath and Creed of Presidential Candidate	19
Jesuits	22
Syllabus of Errors	25
Freedom of Religion	26
Murder of non-Catholics	27
No Salvation for non-Catholics	29
Catholic Men Organized into Pressure Groups	30
Catholic Judges	32
Catholic Doctors	33
Catholic Control of News	34
Catholic Movie Stars	35
Catholic "Bosses"	36
Catholic Underworld	37
Catholic Police Force	37
Public Funds for Catholic Institutions	38
Catholic Immigrants	40
American History Rewritten	41
American Textbooks Rewritten	42
Origin of the "Church" and of the "Roman Church"	43
Temporal Power of the Pope	44
Forgeries of the Roman Church	45
Papal States	45
False Decretals	46
Immunity of Roman Clergy	46
Ecclesiastical Dungeons	49
Military Draft	50
Catholic Loyalty in War	50
Roman Law above American Law	52
Secret Concordats with the Vatican	53
Rape of Ireland and England	54
Fascism	56

	page
South American Dictators	58
Vatican Spy System	59
Stepinac, Artukovic, Mindszenty	59
Public Schools	60
Public Funds for Private Schools	64
Jesuit Infiltration	66
Secret Monks and Nuns	71
Free War Time Travel	76
Vatican Intrigue in War	76
Ex-Priests in U. S.	78
History of Monachism	78
Immorality of Monks and Nuns	79
Penal Institutions	80
Immunity from Inspection	81
Silence of the Press	85
President Subject to Rome	86
Separation of Church and State	87
Senator Kennedy's Statement	89
Democracy Condemned	91
No Divorce	92
No Civil Marriage	93
Only One True Religion	95
Freedom of Religion	95
Lincoln's Assassination	96
Political History of the Church	98
Corruption of the Papacy	100
Pope and Labor	104
Anti-Protestant Smear Campaign	106
Catholic Victory in 1960?	109
Al Smith's Creed	111
Kennedy's Creed	112
Conclusion	113
Appendix	114
Bibliography	117

POPE'S CONDEMNATION OF DEMOCRACY

Hitler wrote 'Mein Kampf', a blueprint of aggression, and no one took him seriously till he actually invaded all of Europe. It would be catastrophical if the free world would make the same mistake by ignoring the papal blueprints for the destruction of democracy.

Pope Leo XIII (d. 1903) in his infallible Bull "Immortale Dei" attacks the democratic movements in Protestant countries and singles out the American form of democracy, though carefully avoiding the name of our country. He denounces as heresy the American principle that all men are created equal. Freedom of religion, freedom of speech and freedom of the press are termed principles of "unbridled liberty" (effrenatae libertatis). When President Lincoln defined democracy as a government of the people, by the people and for the people, the Pope denounced it as the Rule of the Mob. He condemned majority rule, because the majority can be wrong and may prefer evil and heresy to justice and truth. Hence, he concluded, a government by the mob cannot be of God. He attacks the democratic system of voting because it forever endangers the office of those in power.

The Pope denounces the American system of civil marriages. He maintains that civil powers are subservient and subject to ecclesiastical authority, and receive their authority and jurisdiction from God (or His Vicar), not from the people. He denounces as heresy the American principle that the State may not favor one religion over the other. He condemns the American principle that man may follow his own conscience in matters of religion, and may worship God as he sees fit. He condemns the American principle of separation of Church and State, and he calls it an invention of the "lovers of the most shameless liberty" (ab impudentissimae libertatis amatoribus.)

Though forbidding Roman Catholic laymen to meddle in the politics of Roman Catholic countries, the Pope instructs the Roman Catholics of Protestant countries (America) to run for public office. He explains that by doing so they do not publicly approve the democratic way of life, but by infiltration they will

obtain the necessary power to "change" the present system, to infuse Roman Catholic principles into American life and legislation, and to make America Roman Catholic.

The Pope further explains that his Constitution and his laws have priority over our Constitutional laws, and that all Roman Catholics owe first and foremost allegiance and obedience to the bishops of their church. No one is allowed to lead the double life of pretending to be a Roman subject and an American citizen at the same time whenever the laws of Rome conflict with those of America. Last but not least, the pope instructs Roman Catholic authors and newspapermen to forget their former loyalties and to present the Roman cause in print everywhere.

Before we quote the most important passages of this papal Bull, may we first refresh your memory with the terminology and dates of a few American documents?

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE, 1776.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that ALL MEN ARE CREATED EQUAL, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable RIGHTS, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, DERIVING THEIR JUST POWERS FROM THE CONSENT OF THE GOVERNED."

BILL OF RIGHTS, 1791.

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of RELIGION, or prohibiting the FREE exercise thereof; or ABRIDGING THE FREEDOM OF SPEECH OR OF THE PRESS" (Amendment I).

LINCOLN'S GETTYSBURG ADDRESS, 1863.

"Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, CONCEIVED IN LIBERTY, and dedicated to the proposition that ALL MEN ARE CREATED EQUAL . . . that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of FREEDOM, and that GOVERNMENT OF THE PEOPLE, BY THE PEOPLE, FOR THE PEOPLE shall not perish from the earth."

CONSTITUTIO CHRISTIANA

CHRISTIAN CONSTITUTION

or

"IMMORTALE DEI", ENCYCLICAL OF POPE LEO XIII, NOV. 1, 1885

Calling the demands of the masses for equality (egalite') and for freedom of speech, of religion, of the press, etc., a movement "OF UNBRIDLED LIBERTY" (effrenatae libertatis), Pope Leo (d. 1903) explains and condemns democracy as follows:

"Eorum principiorum illud est maximum: omnes homines, quemadmodum generre naturae similes intelliguntur, ita reapse esse in actione vitae inter se pares . . . cogitare de re qualibet quae velit (agere quod lubeat), libere posse . . .

His informata disciplinis societate, principatus non est nisi populi voluntas, qui, ut in sui ipsius unice est potestas, ita sibi metispi solus imperat . . . ita tamen ut imperii non tam *jus*, quam *munus* in eos transferat, idque suo nomine exercendum.

In silentio jacet dominatio divina . . . (vel) principatus cogitari posset ullus, cuius non in Deo ipso causa et vis et auctoritas tota resideat. Quomodo, ut perspicitur, est republica nihil aliud nisi magistra et gubernatrix sui multitudi.

"Of their (democratic) principles this one is the most important: that ALL MEN ARE UNDERSTOOD TO BE EQUAL by birth and by nature, so that in reality they are equals throughout the course of their lives . . . that he should be FREE to think what he likes in every matter . . .

In a society guided under such rule, there is no other legal authority than the consent of the people, who, as the power is vested exclusively in them, so they alone govern themselves . . . thus they transfer not so much the right as the function of the government to themselves, and that to be exercised in their name.

Divine rule is passed over in silence . . . as if there could be any government whose whole cause, power and authority was not vested in God himself. In this manner, as we see, the State is nothing else than a MOB as its own master and governor.

. . . Hinc profecto illa nascuntur: exlex uniuscujusque conscientiae judicum . . . legum ecclesiasticarum nulla habetur ratio: Ecclesia . . . jubetur nihil attingere.

. . . Quare ad jurisdictionem suam trahunt matrimonia Christianorum.

. . . principio clamant, dissociari Ecclesiae rationes a reipublicae rationibus opprime.

. . . Ejusmodi de regenda civitate sententias ipsa naturalis ratio convincit, a veritate dissidere plurimum.
. . . timor aliquis turbarum semper impendeat.

. . . HUJUSMODI DOCTRINAS . . . Romani pontifices . . . impune abire nequaquam passi sunt:

Sic Gregorius XVI per Encyclicas litteras hoc initio *Mirari vos*, die xv Augusti anno 1832, magna sententiarum gravitate ea perculit . . . in culte divino nullum adhibere delectum opertere: integrum singulis esse, quod malint, de religione judicare: solam cuique suam esse conscientiam judicem . . .

De rationibus rei sacrae rei que civilis distrahendis sic idem pontifex: 'Neque lacti-

. . . Hence the following principles have been born: the judgment of every man's conscience is above the law . . . No consideration is given to ecclesiastical laws: the church is ordered not to interfere in anything.

. . . Thus they bring under their own jurisdiction the marriages of Christians.

. . . They (democrats) start out with shouting that the affairs of the Church must be separated from those of the State.

. . . Natural reason alone proves that such principles concerning the government of a State are very far removed from the truth.
. . . a certain fear of mass-reactions hangs forever over our heads

. . . SUCH DOCTRINES . . . the Roman Pontiffs . . . by no means suffered to go without condemnation:

Thus Gregory XVI in his Encyclical Letter 'Mirari vos' of Aug. 15, 1832, denounced in very grave terms these doctrines . . . namely, that in matters of divine worship no preference should be shown; that it is right for individuals to judge matters of religion as they see fit; that the conscience of each man shall be his sole guide . . .

The same Pontiff spoke about the motives for separating Church and State as follows: 'Neither can

ora et religioni et principatu ominari possemus ex eorum votis, qui Ecclesiam a regno separari . . . Constat quippe perimesci ab impudentissimae libertatis amatoribus concordiam illam . . .

Ex iis autem pontificum praescriptis illa omnino intelligi necesse est, ortum publicae potestas a Deo ipso, non a multitudine repeti operere.

. . . (Officia religionis nullo loco numerare), vel uno modo esse in disparibus generibus affectos, nefas esse privatis hominibus, nefas civitatis: immoderatam sentienti sensus palam jactandi potestatem non esse in civium juribus . . .

Haec quidem sunt, quae de constituendis temperandisque civitatibus ab Ecclesia Catholica praecipiuntur:

. . . nulla per se reprehenditur ex reipublicae formis, ut quae *nihil* habent quod doctrinae Catholicae repugnet . . .

As the government of the U.S. upholds the validity of civil marriages contracted by Christians; as it believes in government of the people (mob), by the people and for the people; as it believes that men are created equal and endowed with unalienable rights; as it believes that government derives its power from the governed; as it upholds freedom of religion, freedom of

we expect more favorable results either for religion or for the government from the wishes of those who plan to separate the Church from the State . . . It is evident that such a concord is naturally feared by the lovers of the most shameless liberty . . .

From these verdicts of the Popes it must be absolutely understood that the origin of public power is to be sought from God himself and not from the mob.

. . . that it is a crime for private individuals and a crime for States . . . to treat different kinds of religions in one and the same way; that the unabridged power of thinking and of publicly sounding off one's opinion is not among the rights of the citizens . . .

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, then, teaches concerning the constitution and government of States as follows:

. . . None of the various forms of governments is *per se* condemned so long as they have *nothing* which is repugnant to Catholic doctrine . . .

speech and freedom of the press, American democracy is contrary to Roman Catholic doctrine and, therefore, is condemned.

Itaque in tam difficii rerum cursu Catholici homines, si nos, ut oportet, audierint, facile videbunt quae sua cū jusque sint tam in *opinionibus* quam in *factis officia*.

... Item Catholicorum hominum operam ex hoc tanquam angustiore campo longius excurrere, ipsamque summam rempublicam complecti generatim utile est atque honestum. *Generatim* eo dicimus quia haec praecepta nostra gentes universas attingunt.

... Quamobrem perspicuum est, ad rempublicam adeundi causam esse justam Catholicis: non enim adeunt, neque adire debent ob eam causam, ut probent quod est hoc tempore in rerum publicarum rationibus non honestum, sed ut has ipsas rationes, quoad fieri potest, in bonum publicum *transferant* sincerum atque verum; destinatum animo habentes, sicutiam virtutemque Catholicae religionis, tamquam saluberrimum succum ac sanguinem, in omnes reipublicae venas inducere.

Haud aliter actum in primis Ecclesiae aetatibus . . .

Therefore, in such a complicated course of events, Catholic men, if, as they should, they will listen to Us, will easily see what are their own and the others' duties both in matters of thought and of action.

... And so, in general, it is proper and honorable that the concern of Catholic men should be directed beyond this narrow field and that it should embrace the entire field of public administration. We say here, *in general*, because these Our precepts reach unto all nations.

... Wherefore it is clear that there is a just reason for Catholics to seek public office; for they do not, nor must they seek office for the reason that they may approve that which is morally wrong in the present form of government, but in order that they may *change* this very form, as far as possible, for the common good, pure and true; keeping in mind this goal: to infuse into all the veins of government the most healthy sap and blood, that is, the wisdom and virtue of the Catholic religion.

This same method was employed in the early centuries of

Qua ratione celeriter instituta christiana non modo in privatas domos, sed in castra, in curiam, in ipsam regiam invexere.

As the early christians infiltrated the government of pagan Rome, so Roman Catholics must infiltrate the governments of Protestant countries, by blindly following the written instructions of the Pope and the oral instructions of their bishops.

... Jamvero his temporibus consentaneum est, haec majorum exempla renovari. Catholicos quidem, quotquot digni sunt eo nomine, primum omnium necesse est amantissimos Ecclesiae filios et esse et videri velle: quae res nequeant cum hac laude consistere, eas sine cunctatione respuerunt: institutis populorum . . . uti: . . . dare operam ut ad eam, quam diximus, christianam similitudinem et formam omnis respublicae traducatur.

Harum rerum adipiscendarum ratio constituit uno certo modo haud commode potest cum debeat singulis locis temporibusque, quae sunt multum inter se disparia, convenire. Nihilominus conservanda in primis est voluntatum concordia, quaerendaque agendorum similitudo. Atque optime utrumque impetrabitur, si Prescripta Sedis Apostolicae legem vitae singuli putent,

the Church. . . By this method Christian principles found their way not only into private homes, but into the army, the senate and into the royal palace itself.

... Now, in our times it is fitting that we renew these examples of our forefathers. Catholics indeed, as many as are worthy of the name, must before all things be and be willing to show themselves to be, most loving sons of the Church; all things inconsistent with this honor, they must without hesitation reject; they must use public institutions . . . and must labor to this end that the whole State shall be *transformed* into what we have called a christian image and likeness.

The means to obtaining these ends cannot easily be regulated by one and the same method, because they must fit particular places and circumstances, which differ considerably from each other. Nevertheless, let unity of planning be maintained and let uniformity of action be sought above all things. And both will be best attained if all regard the orders of the Apostolic See as the rule of life and take orders from the Bishops . . .

atque Episcopis obtemperarent . . .

As the laws of the Roman Catholic Church and of the Protestant States are incompatible, may a Roman Catholic politician follow the double standard of obeying the laws of his church in private life and obeying the laws of his country in public life?

Pariter non licere aliam officii formam privatim sequi, aliam publicae, ita scilicet ut Ecclesiae auctoritas in vita privata observetur, in publica respuantur . . .

May Roman Catholic journalists, commentators and other authors follow the policies of their paper, party, or country?

Omninoque istud p[re]cep-
tum teneant qui cogitationes
suas solent mandare litteris,
maximeque ephemeredum
ancetes. In hac quidem de
rebus maximus contentionis
nil est intestinis concertationibus, vel partium studiis
reliquendum loci . . . Si quid
igitur dissidiorum ante fuit,
oportet voluntaria quadam
oblivione conterere . . . et
p[re]cepcio quodam omnium
in Apostolicam Sedem obse-
quio redimendum.

... Hacc quidem, Venerabiles Fratres, habuimus, quae universis Catholici orbis gentibus traderneremus de civitatum Constitutione Christiana, officiisque civium singulorum ...

Likewise it is not permissible to follow one line of duty in private and another in public, so that the authority of the Church shall be observed in private, and repudiated in public . . .

And this Precept must be kept unconditionally by those who are wont to commit their thoughts to writing, especially by those who write for newspapers. In their contention for the higher things there is no room left for internal conflicts or preferences of parties . . . If, therefore, there existed some dissensions before, let them be voluntarily done away with and forgotten . . . and especially by obedience to the Apostolic See.

... These then, Venerable Brethren, are the teachings which We hold and which We hereby transmit to all nations of the Catholic world concerning the Christian Constitution of States and concerning the duties of their individual citizens. . . .

Datum Romae apud S.
Petrum die 1: novembris an-
no 1885, pontificatus nostri
anno octavo.

Given at Rome in the St. Peter,
on the first day of November, in
the year 1885, of our pontificate
the eighth.

anno octavo. the eighth.
Leo PP. XIII Pope Leo XIII
(*Acta S. Sedis* 18, 161-180; *Leonis XIII. Acta* 5, 118-150)

OATH OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Presidents of the United States must take the following oath: "I do solemnly swear that I will faithfully . . . preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States" (*U.S. Constitution*, Art. 2).

No Roman Catholic is required to publicly renounce his faith in his religious leader in Italy. Neither is a Roman Catholic compelled to seek the presidential office of a Protestant or non-Catholic country. However, when a Roman Catholic seeks the presidency of a non-Catholic country with the intention of breaking his presidential oath and of committing perjury and treason, this man is not qualified for this highest office of the land. These facts are self-evident, and those who present these facts are not bigots but true patriots.

PROPOSED OATH OF THE PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE

No Roman Catholic devotee, Roman Catholic sympathizer, or non-Catholic secretly committed to Rome, is fit and worthy of the American presidency unless he can conscientiously subscribe to the following declaration:

WHEREAS the "Christian Constitution" of the Roman Catholic Church (*Bull "Immortale Dei"*) condemns the most fundamental laws of the American Constitution, and declares heretical those democratic principles which are most highly revered by the American people; and

WHEREAS the same Roman Constitution holds it unlawful for a candidate of the Roman Catholic faith to protect and defend in public life laws and principles which are contrary to papal laws and principles:

I hereby solemnly swear, without any mental reservation, that I denounce as heretical and subversive all papal doctrines, pre-

cepts and directives which are repugnant to the laws and democratic principles of our American Constitution and our American institutions.

CREED OF ANY PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE

As every loyal American citizen subscribes to the following American principles, assuredly a worthy candidate for the American presidency could have no objection to subscribing to the following declarations:

1. I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people; and I do solemnly swear that I owe no allegiance to any person or organization which opposes this American principle and which seeks to corrupt the minds of our citizens by defining democracy as the rule by the mob.

2. I believe that the just power of the American government is derived from the consent of the governed, i.e., the American people, and that its authority is not vested in, not subordinate to, nor dependent upon the consent and divine jurisdiction assumed by any religious leader, foreign or domestic.

3. I believe this truth to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; and I reject as heretical and subversive the theory that certain privileged men and classes are predestined by birth, by religion or by ordination to rule dictatorially over the secular and civil affairs of their fellow citizens.

4. I believe that liberty is one of the certain unalienable rights of men; and I reject as untrue the medieval concept that man by nature is subject to masters and rulers in whose election or elevation he had no voice, direct or indirect. I do solemnly swear that I owe no allegiance to any person or organization which denies that this nation was conceived in liberty.

5. I believe in freedom of religion; and I disown allegiance to any leader or organization which holds that man is not free to follow his own conscience and to worship God as he sees fit.

6. I believe in the unabridged freedom of speech and of the press; and I disown allegiance to any person or group which ridicules this American principle by calling it "unbridled liberty", and which denies that this particular freedom is among the rights

of citizens.

7. I believe in separation of Church and State; and I disown allegiance to any religious leader who dares to anathematize and excommunicate his subjects for adherence to this American principle.

8. I believe that churches and people of all faiths have equal rights and that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; and I do solemnly swear that I owe no allegiance to any person or organization which rejects the Bill of Rights and which holds that the Roman Catholic faith must be made the state religion of all nations, that it must receive preference over all other religions even when in the minority, and that it is a crime for private citizens and for States to treat non-Catholic religions on an equal basis.

9. I believe that the Protestant, Greek Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Jewish and other faiths are to be treated equal according to the Constitution of my country; and I promise that, if elected, I will refuse to give diplomatic and political preference to any particular religious ruler by appointing an American ambassador to him, by concluding a concordate with him, or by making any secret commitments to him or to his American representatives.

10. I believe that the American laws, constitutions and the authority vested by the people in the President are supreme, and not subordinate to foreign laws or a foreign constitution; and I solemnly swear that I do not owe allegiance to any foreign ruler or organization which holds that our Constitution is unconstitutional and not binding in conscience wherever it is contrary to ecclesiastical laws and pontifical decrees.

11. I believe that the marriages of American citizens performed by the Justice of the Peace or before an authorized minister are valid, regardless of the faith wherein the parties happened to be baptized; and I disown allegiance to any person or organization which holds that the State may not and cannot join in matrimony certain citizens of certain faiths, and which holds that civil marriages of certain parties are invalid and that the offspring thereof is illegitimate.

12. I believe that one is not faithful to his oath of office in case one seeks the office of the President for the purpose of destroying the democratic principles laid down by our Constitution; and I do solemnly swear that I do not owe allegiance to any person or organization which demands its members to infiltrate the branches of government for the direct purpose of overthrowing our democratic form of government and supplanting it by a foreign, religious, or fascist rule.

BULL "LIBERTAS PRAESTANTISSIMUM"

The same Pope Leo XIII (d. 1903) condemned our American form of government on many other occasions. In his Encyclical "Libertas praestantissimum" (June 20, 1888) he declared the "American principle of 'Separation of Church and State' a "pernicious maxim", and he concluded:

"From what has been said, it follows that it is in no way lawful to demand, to defend, or to grant promiscuous freedom of thought, of speech, of writing, or of religion, as if they were so many rights which nature had given to man."

As a Roman Catholic is forbidden to "defend" the very first article of the Bill of Rights, it follows that he cannot take the oath of office to "defend the Constitution" without committing perjury.

At this point we may warn our reader not to be misled by the *jesuitical adjective* 'promiscuous'. Jesuit authors are known for employing certain adjectives which they want the reader to interpret as being derogative, but which, in case of criticism, can be falsely explained as qualifying. For example, Jesuits will seldom or never denounce "communism" pure and simple, but always attack "atheistic communism", just in case communism would be victorious. So they speak of *promiscuous, unbridled, unabridged* and *most shameless liberty*, while clearly condemning all forms of democratic freedom.

THE JESUITS

The Jesuit Order was founded after the Reformation under Pope Paul III (d. 1550) for the direct purpose of destroying Protestantism. As the early Christians successfully penetrated

the upper classes of pagan Rome, so the Jesuits were to secretly infiltrate the governments, seminaries, society and political groups in Protestant countries. Contrary to the early Christians, the Jesuits were allowed to use any means to obtain their ends, such as spying, bribery, prostitution, blackmail, assassination, revolution and war. Jesuitry is a Spanish invention with all the fanatic intolerance and absolute disregard for human rights of the Spanish Inquisition.

The most dangerous of all Jesuits are the 'lay-jesuits' or secret 'externs' who may hide their real identity by posing as non-Catholics or even as atheists (about which later). As early as Dec. 1, 1581, Edmund Campion, a British Jesuit disguised as a jewelry salesman, was hanged at Tyburn as a traitor for planning the assassination of Queen Elizabeth and for advocating the overthrowing of her legal government by force. Dr. Joseph McCabe, an ex-priest, relates how a disguised Jesuit taught for years at a Lutheran College in Sweden (*Truth about the Catholic Church*; Girard, 1926, p. 52). The Jesuits became such masters of deceit, intrigue, greed and unscrupulousness that they began to employ the same methods in Catholic countries and became a menace to the papacy itself. Pope Clement XIV decreed that the Jesuit Order must be suppressed, abrogated, abolished, "destroyed and extinguished for ever." (*Bull of Suppression*, "Dominus ac Redemptor," July 21, 1773). The Jesuits, however, continued to function in Russia and the United States, and went underground in other countries.

Besides Protestantism, Rome was confronted with new enemies within its own ranks: liberalism and democracy. In the days of Voltaire (d. 1778), Thomas Paine (d. 1809), etc., the Vatican was convinced that the papacy was at its end. With horror Rome heard of the American Declaration of Independence (1776) and the Bill of Rights (1791). The National Convention of France (1792) ended the reign of the royal House of Bourbon and created the First French Republic. Even Napoleon treated Pope Pius VI (d. 1800) with total contempt. The democratic wave which swept over two continents was considered far more dangerous to papal supremacy than protestantism. Consequently, Pope Pius VII (Aug. 7, 1814) was forced to call the dreaded Jesuits back in power.

In 1814 the Jesuits again donned their clerical garb in those

countries where they were not banned by civil law, but they kept their huge army of underground members in civilian clothes. Beginning with the reign of Pope Pius IX (1846-1878) the Jesuits were in complete and permanent control of the papacy, or rather they abolished it. Since the middle of the 19th century the pope is nothing but a figure head, completely divorced from the administration of his church, exclusively occupied with official celebrations, shaking hands with dignitaries, blessing the throngs of pilgrims, a dummy which only speaks when the Jesuits pull the strings, and with no more political power than the Queen of England. The first completely Jesuit-dominated and Jesuit-guarded prisoner of the Vatican, Pope Pius IX, published some 30 papal Bulls and Encyclicals, all of which were written by the Jesuits. Every one of these papal writings is an attack against both Protestant and democratic principles. To assure themselves of totalitarian powers, the Jesuits declared their first dummy pope "infallible", "supreme", and above any ecumenical council of bishops (*Vatican Council, Bull "Pastor aeternus", July 18, 1870*). After the Bull "Pastor aeternus" the "Syllabus of Errors" is the most renowned of the alleged infallible writings of Pope Pius IX.

SYLLABUS OF ERRORS
(*Acta et Decreta Concilii Vaticani, Freiburg, 1871*)
SYLLABUS ERRORUM of Pope Pius IX, Dec. 8, 1864

The "Syllabus", according to the Catholic Encyclopedia, is "the name given to two series of propositions containing modern religious errors condemned respectively by Pius IX (1864) and Pius X (1907)" (C.E. 14, 368). The official title explains that the contents of the Syllabus is nothing new, but a combination of the chief errors already condemned in numerous other papal writings. The real purpose of the Bull is an attempt to ridicule Democratic Constitutions, or "to bring together under the form of a Constitution the chief errors of the time and to condemn them" (C.E. 14, 368). This papal ridicule of our Constitution is "infallible", because "the binding force of the condemnation in regard to all the propositions is beyond doubt . . . All Catholics, therefore, are bound to accept the Syllabus" (C.E. 14, 369).

The Syllabus contains 80 articles, theses or propositions, popularly held by non-Catholics. Contrary to other Bulls, the Jesuits chose the positive form of these alleged heresies in order to phrase the democratic views in a more awkward manner. Thus the Syllabus condemns as error the articles or propositions quoted, and all Roman Catholics are bound under pain of excommunication to hold the opposite as of true faith and morals.

Pope Pius IX, like all Jesuit-appointed popes, has been described as a saintly man, but his former classmates knew better and have publicly stated otherwise. As modern popes are actually prisoners of the Vatican and have their private lives shielded far better than our secular rulers, we have no official records of his immorality, as we have of nearly all medieval popes. However, a man may be judged by his friends. His close friend and papal Secretary, Cardinal Antonelli, was so immoral that he was feared throughout Italy. Antonelli, generally believed to have been a secret Jesuit, denied that he ever had been ordained a priest. This 'unordained' Cardinal left an estate of \$20,000,000 which his illegitimate daughter, Countess Lambertini, publicly claimed as her legal inheritance. His life story can be found in the Encyclopedia Britannica, though a jesuitical pen re-edited its contents in 1928.

Whether Pope Pius was a pious or impious man is of little

importance. His Syllabus of Errors is the work of Jesuits and its teachings are still infallibly upheld by the Jesuits of today. A large portion of the Syllabus was compiled by American Jesuits, immediately after Lincoln's Gettysburg Address (Nov. 19, 1863), paving the way for his assassination (1865). We do not have the space to comment on all of its articles, but we will select a few of the most important ones, beginning with article twelve. Therefore condemned and excommunicated is anyone who holds that:

12. Apostolicæ Sedis, Romanarumque Congregationum decretæ liberum scientiae progressum impeditum.

12. The decrees of the Roman Congregations impede the free progress of science.

The truth of this condemned proposition can be demonstrated by this example. In 1616 Pope Paul V and the Roman Congregation of the Index condemned the theory of Copernicus (*Mirbt*, No. 510), and Pope Paul V, Pope Urban VIII and the Roman Inquisition (1632) condemned the scientist Galileo for holding that the earth moves (*Mirbt*, No. 515), a scientific fact known by every seven year old child of this space age. Galileo was thrown in a dungeon and forced to retract his 'heresies'. Till the 19th century Catholics were forbidden to read his books. Yet, if a Roman Catholic should hold today that these papal decrees impeded the progress of science, he is excommunicated. Poverty and illiteracy are the characteristics of all Roman Catholic countries. Rome now tries to remedy her shortage of scientists by rewriting our text-books. The great Pasteur, for example, was baptized as a child but left the Roman Church as a student and died outside her pale. Yet, in 1928 a jesuitical pen rewrote his life in the *Encyclopedie Britannica* and added that he was a "devout Catholic".

15. Liberum cuique homini est eam amplecti ac profiteri religionem, quam rationis lumine quis ductus veram putaverit.

15. Every man is free to embrace and profess that religious faith which, guided by the light of reason, he shall believe to be true.

Contrary to our Constitution, this Roman Constitution condemns freedom of religion. "No Catholic can in conscience de-

fend such an idea of freedom of religious worship. For, according to Catholic principles, the only religion that has a genuine right to exist is the Catholic religion" (*Ecclesiastical Review*, Oct., 1943). "The Catholic Church . . . must demand the right of freedom for herself alone, because such a right can only be possessed by truth, never by error" (*Civiltà Cattolica*, April, 1948, *Italian Jesuit monthly*). Rome does not only preach, but practices this medieval intolerance wherever it is in power. In Catholic Spain prostitution is publicly approved and supervised, but public Protestantism is illegal. Though the U. S. has poured billions of Protestant dollars into Spain under various pretexts, no Protestant may publicly worship God. "Open-air ceremonies or demonstrations other than those of the Catholic religion, shall not be tolerated" (*Spanish Charter of July 17, 1945*, Art. 6). This same prohibition of non-Catholic religious ceremonies is to be introduced in all countries. Monsignor John A. Ryan, professor of the Catholic University in Washington, D.C., pretends to express a very liberal view about Protestant ceremonies when he writes: "If these are carried on within the family, or in such inconspicuous manner as to be an occasion neither of scandal nor of perversion to the faithful, they may be properly tolerated by the State" (*John A. Ryan, The State and the Church*; New York, Macmillan, 1922, p. 35).

The very first Latin Father of the Church, Bishop Tertullian, wrote at the beginning of the third century: "It is a fundamental human right, a privilege of nature, that every man should worship according to his convictions. It is certainly no part of religion to spread itself by force. It must be embraced freely, and not be imposed" (*Migne, P. L. vol. 1*, p. 777). Today, Rome not only claims that her religion has the sole right to exist on this earth, but she holds that she has the divine right to use physical force, torture and the death penalty to compel non-Catholics to embrace her religion. Though this subject belongs rightfully under Article 24, we will briefly comment on it here.

Pope Urban II (d. 1099) was the first pope to approve the murder of heretics (*Migne, P. L. 151*, 394). Pope Innocent III (1215) was the first to grant indulgences to those who kill heretics, and more than one million Western Europeans were thus murdered during his reign (*Mansi 22*, 982). St. Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274) was the first Roman Catholic theologian to

approve the murder of heretics: "They deserve . . . to be shut off from this world by death. For it is a much more serious matter to corrupt faith . . . than to counterfeit money . . . With much more justice the heretics, immediately upon conviction, are not only to be excommunicated, but also to be put to death" (*Summa Theol. II, II, qu. 11*). Catechisms of Roman Catholic countries teach children that Rome has the right to murder Protestants and other heretics: "Question. What are the other penalties which the Church applies to the crime of heresy? Answer. Confiscation of goods, imprisonment, exile and death" (*Catechisme Catholique Romain de St. Pie V. Bruxelles, 1827*, p. 256). All professors of Roman Catholic seminaries teach till this day that Rome has the right to murder heretics. Cardinal Lepicier, professor at the Roman University of De Propaganda Fide, has written a work of 25 volumes on Dogmatics and has an article on "The Church has the right to condemn heretics to death," which follows the Rule of St. Benedict when it says: "It is a wholesome and praiseworthy thing to put a person to death for the good of the community. . . . Perhaps this doctrine will seem too drastic for this age. . . . When one considers what harm it does to society, one will easily understand that, if traitors or murderers are justly condemned to die, those who publicly undermine the Catholic faith deserve more rightfully to be put to death. . . . As proof of our argument we have the 24th condemned proposition of the SYLLABUS of Pius IX: 'The Church has not the right to use force'" (*Lepicier, De stabilitate et progressu Dogmatis, part 2, art. 6, p. 175*). The Catholic Encyclopedia teaches the same (C. E. 14, 768-769). American bishops teach the same. The Diocese of Brooklyn, N. Y. teaches: "Heresy is an awful crime. . . . If the State has the right to punish treason with death. . . . the Church. . . . has the right and power to take means to safeguard its existence" (*Brooklyn Tablet, Nov. 5, 1938*). If Rome has the power and right to murder any heretic, she has the right to murder an American president who is not of her faith. Roman Catholics who hold that Rome may not interfere with the individual belief of free citizens, and does not have the right to murder non-Catholics, are excommunicated, and become 'heretics' themselves, subject to death.

16. Homines in cuiusvis re-

16. Men can find the way of eter-

ligionis cultu viam aeternae salutis reperire aeternamque salutem assequi possunt.

17. Saltem bene sperandum est de aeterna illorum omnium salute, qui in vera Christi Ecclesia nequaquam versantur.

18. Protestantismum non aliud est quam diversa verae ejusdem Christianae religionis forma, in qua aequa ac in Ecclesia Catholica Deo placere datum est.

In another Bull the same pope explains that there is no salvation for Roman Catholics either, unless they believe that the Protestants have no salvation: "We must hold as of faith that outside of the apostolic Roman Church there is no salvation; Tenendum quippe ex fide est, extra apostolicam Romanam Ecclesiam salvum fieri neminem posse" (*Singulari quadam*, Dec. 9, 1854). Dozens of other Bulls contain the same dogma. Thus American Roman Catholics must hold that 80 per cent of the American citizens are heading for hell. The recent Boston incident (Father Feeney, S.J.) is an old Jesuit trick and huge deception. It does not have the infallible sanction of Rome. Besides, the term "invincible ignorance" implies total and permanent insanity, or complete impossibility of learning the truth. Simple ignorance is no excuse. Hence the term does not apply to American citizens. Even a 'chance' or "well-founded hope" must be ruled out. Those who dare to maintain that some well-minded Protestants may obtain salvation are referred to as "pests" (pestes), and Art. 21 anathematizes those who deny that "the religion of the Catholic Church is the only true religion."

19. Ecclesia non est vera perfectaque societas plane libera, nec pollet suis propriis et constantibus iuribus sibi a divino suo fundatore

nal salvation and can obtain eternal salvation in any kind of religion.

17. We may entertain at least a well-founded hope of the eternal salvation of all those who do not belong to the true Church of Christ.

18. Protestantism is nothing more than another form of the same true Christian religion, in which it is possible to be equally pleasing to God as in the Catholic Church.

19. The (Roman) Church is not a true, perfect and entirely independent society, nor does she enjoy specific and perpetual rights conferred upon her by her Divine

collatis, sed civilis potestatis est definire quae sint Ecclesiae jura exercere queat.

Many other papal Bulls contain the same dogma; the State is said to have no other rights than those delegated to her by the Church.

22. Obligatio, qua Catholici magistri et scriptores omnino adstringuntur, coarctatur in iis tantum, quae ab infallibili Ecclesiae judicio veluti fidei dogmata ab omnibus credenda proponuntur.

The first professions to be organized by Rome as secret propaganda and pressure groups were the school teachers, journalists and authors of books. Once they were organized and had taken their oath of fidelity, they were informed that their oath not only bound them under pain of hell to set forth the religious doctrines of Rome, but also bound them to further the political aims of Rome.

Today, nearly all professional groups have been organized as Catholic pressure groups. In Protestant Holland, for example, we not only find buildings with big signs, reading: "Roman Catholic Daily", "Roman Catholic Farmers' Loan Bank", "Roman Catholic Labor Party", etc., but we find that every group, including the "Roman Catholic Goat Breeding Association", has been organized, and that Roman Catholics are forbidden under pain of hell to join a neutral (non-Catholic) organization or to read any neutral newspaper. Here in the U. S. we have been acquainted with such organizations as the Knights of Columbus, Holy Name Society, League of Decency, Catholic Men Society, Catholic Veterans, Catholic police and firemen, etc., but now find that Catholic doctors, Catholic druggists, Catholic lawyers, Catholic bankers, etc., including Roman Catholic Television Camera Operators, have been organized throughout our land, seeking segregation in every field. The Catholic Almanac and Directory list the following Catholic organizations:

Founder, but it belongs to the civil power to define what are the rights and limits within which the Church may exercise her rights.

22. The obligation which binds Catholic TEACHERS AND AUTHORS applies only to those things which are proclaimed by the infallible judgment of the Church as dogmas of faith and as binding to all.

Association of Catholic Trade Unionists (A.C.T.U.)
Catholic Labor Institute (with 2 offices in Los Angeles)
Catholic Petroleum Guild (for employees of oil companies)
Catholic Institute of the Food Industry
Guild of Catholic executives and employees of Insurance Companies
Guild of Catholic executives in the Liquor, Beer & Wine Industry
Guild for Catholic Airline employees
Guild for Catholic Railroad employees
St. Gabriel's Guild for Postal and Federal employees

All large city, county, state and federal offices have Catholic Action groups organized into guilds:

City Police Dept.—Communion Breakfast Club
City Fire Dept.—Holy Name Society
Water, Gas & Electricity—Catholic Guilds
Telephone Company—Catholic Guilds
Dept. of Welfare; Dept. of Hospitals; Dept. of Finance; Office of the Comptroller; Civil Service; etc.

Catholic Institute of the Press (for journalists)
Catholic Newsmen's Association (for newspaper employees)

All city papers have their Catholic Guilds which are incorporated into Catholic Press Councils which again take orders from the Catholic Press Department in Washington.

National League of Decency (to censor movies, books, etc.)
Catholic Broadcasters Associations (throughout the States)
Catholic Actors' Guild of America
Catholic Writers' Guild
Catholic Apostolate of Radio, T.V. and Advertising (organized by Irene Dunne under the cloak of Communion Breakfasts)
Guilds of Catholic Physicians (organized into a federation like the AMA)
Guild of Catholic Psychiatrists
St. Apollonia Guild of Catholic Dentists
St. Cosmo & Damian Society for Catholic Pharmacists
Druggists' Guild of St. James (to prevent sale of contraceptives)
Catholic Court Attaches Guild for Judges
St. Thomas More Guilds for Catholic Lawyers
Catholic Teachers Association
Catholic Accountants Guilds (in 600 cities)
Catholic Hospital Association of the U.S.A.

All these pressure groups receive free publicity from our news-papers:

"A television camera will be solemnly blessed at St. Joseph's (by) . . . Msgr. John J. Devlin, Archdiocesan head of motion pictures activities . . . The symbolic ceremony (will be) attended by an assembly of TV stars, authors, producers, directors and

technicians . . . The special ceremonies will honor St. Clare, newly appointed patroness of TV" (*L.A. Mirror-News*, 8-9-58).

"His Eminence James Francis Cardinal McIntyre will preside at the traditional Red Mass to be sung at 1 p.m. Aug. 24 in St. Vincent's Church . . . in conjunction with the 81st annual meeting of the American Bar Association here" (*L. A. Mirror-News*, 8-16-58).

"The Sts. Cosmos and Damian Society, an association of Catholic pharmacists, will attend Mass at 9 a.m. tomorrow in St. Vincent's Church (*L.A. Mirror-News*, 8-16-58).

"Doug Bridges of Paramount Pictures yesterday was unanimously elected . . . as president of the Catholic Press Council of Southern California. The election occurred at a communion breakfast in Pucci's, Encino. Others elected . . . Cornelio Baca of the Alhambra Post-Advocate, treasurer, and Jack O'Mara of KTTV, secretary. Named to the executive committee were Dave Bongard of the Herald Express; Jack Granara of Universal International Studios; Phil Hanna, public relations, and Chuck Johnson, sports editor of Tidings" (*L.A. Mirror-News*, 2-16-59).

"More than 2,000 Catholic members of the Motion Picture and Television Industry attended a Solemn Pontifical Mass at the Church of the Blessed Sacrament in Hollywood yesterday" (*L.A. Mirror-News*, 2-8-60).

The members, or at least the leaders, of nearly all these Catholic organizations take oath or solemnly promise that they will defend the Catholic cause in all phases of life. In spite of the American practice of disqualifying jury members who are prejudiced, and contrary to the oath of office taken by the judges of our courts, the Pope, as reported in all our newspapers, instructed Roman Catholic judges "that in any case involving an interest of the Roman Church the judge is under moral compulsion, as a Catholic, to rule in the church's favor." It is, therefore, a general practice in the U. S., where there is a rotation of judges, to postpone cases of Roman Catholics till a Roman Catholic judge takes the bench. Roman Catholic lawyers are forbidden to handle separation and divorce cases without first consulting the ecclesiastical court and following the orders of their diocese. For example, the 50 Roman Catholic lawyers who are members of the St. Thomas More Society of Allegheny County, Pa. are bound by the Diocesan Statute which reads:

"Following a valid marriage, it is strictly forbidden for any Catholic, whether as plaintiff or as attorney, to approach the civil courts to obtain a separation, divorce or annulment, without prior approval of the Bishop." Under the date line, Pittsburgh, Pa., July 5, 1958, the newspapers reported: "Roman Catholic lawyers in the Pittsburgh Diocese were reminded here of a diocesan ruling under which they must consult with the chancery before handling divorce cases." Monsignor Shinar of the chancery office explained to newsmen: "We maintain that an attorney is not competent to judge the existence or non-existence of the sacred contract of marriage" (*L. A. Mirror-News*, 7-5-58).

There are many other instances wherein Catholic judges have violated their oath of office. For example in the matter of eugenic sterilization, which is practised in 27 States but forbidden by Rome, Catholic judges are forbidden to enforce these laws which conflict with Roman canon laws. There are numerous cases where Roman Catholic judges have confined non-Catholic girls to Roman Catholic institutions, clearly following the instructions of their bishops. When officials of American courts have no respect for American law; when they commit perjury by breaking their oath of office; when they refuse to believe in equality and justice for all; when they have a dual allegiance or citizenship, Roman and American, and believe that Roman law has priority over American law, these men are as subversive as any other foreign agents who spit on our flag and trample on our Constitution. The question now arises: should we vote such men into office, even into the highest office of the land; and are we guilty of intolerance when we cast our free vote for a man whom we believe to be more dedicated to our country?

Like Catholic judges, Catholic doctors must also give priority to Roman rules, even when contrary to medical ethics. For example, therapeutic abortion to save the life of a mother is legal in 48 States, but forbidden by Roman canon law. When the life of a non-Catholic mother could be saved by abortion, without which both mother and child would die, the doctor of a Catholic hospital may not even inform the mother (and give her a chance to go to another hospital) but must let her die in ignorance. When a doctor not only refuses to perform a legal operation to save the life of his fellow-citizen, but refuses to inform her that any other doctor could save her life, and thus

willfully orphans her other children, he is a criminal. Rome tries to force her medieval theology on public and county hospitals as well. Protestant patients in New York's public hospitals were refused medical therapeutic information by doctors and county health officials who obviously followed orders of the Roman hierarchy. Should a loyal American citizen vote such Catholic doctors into public office; and if he wishes to cast his free vote for a more loyal citizen, is he intolerant?

Catholic teachers have been organized not only to brainwash parochial school children, but to bring the Public School under Roman Catholic control, as we shall see under Article 45. Every other profession has been organized to overthrow our democratic heritage and to make our land subject to Roman Catholic rule.

By pressure, threats, boycott and censorship they have gained control over most of our newspapers, radio, television and movie industries. For example, when a Bishop warns a certain newspaper under penalty of boycott to suppress all scandal of the Roman clergy (rape, theft, adultery, drunkenness, etc.), when Roman Catholic businessmen and Roman Catholic news agencies demand front page publicity of Catholic news under threat of taking their advertisements elsewhere, our newspapers will oblige for purely financial reasons. As there are no Protestant pressure groups we have a situation wherein a minority can have the picture of their pope almost daily on our front pages while the activities of the greatest Protestant leaders are suppressed; occasional scandals of the Protestant clergy are headlined, while the gross immorality of the Roman clergy is shielded. Consequently, the unsuspecting public receives the false impression that the Roman church is far more decent than the Protestant churches.

Many non-Catholic owners of newspapers, knowing that they are betraying their own people and their own religion, try to bluff their way out by flatly denying that Rome uses pressure on them. There are hundreds of cases of censorship, boycott and blackmail on file. They could not have already forgotten the Martin Luther film. They still must remember the banning of "The Nation" not only from Catholic libraries, but from the Public Schools of New York City, because Paul Blanshard had written a series of factual articles on Roman Catholicism (June, 1948). The Newark, N. J. Board of Education banned the Nation

as early as Jan., 1948. On Sept. 11, 1944, the San Francisco News innocently reported the story of the arrest of a Roman Catholic priest and his woman companion for drunken driving. Though the priest pleaded guilty and paid a fine of \$250, Archbishop Mitty of San Francisco was more outraged against the newspaper than against the priest. As fully reported in Time Magazine, the bishop organized the entire clergy and laity to boycott the News and instructed businessmen to withdraw their advertisements "until the News recognized the well-known weight of the Church" (*Time*, Oct. 23, 1944, p. 59).

As democracy cannot function without a free press, it is a crime to suppress the news or to force others to suppress it.

Rome has founded a League of Decency which under the cloak of religion and of decency tries to control the movie industry by its censorship, while Protestants regard such suppression of freedom unconstitutional. Since Hollywood is only interested in profits and it knows that the Roman League will condemn and boycott any movie which offends Catholic doctrine, such as birth control, or anything derogatory and detrimental to Catholic prestige, our movies are favoring Romanism over Protestantism. Hollywood, for example, places Peter in Rome, which the greatest historians have been unable to accomplish. Ridiculous marriage scenes always have a Protestant minister officiating, while solemn marriages are performed by a priest. All these things, though they may seem trivial to some, have not only great propaganda value, but have pushed Roman Catholic actors, singers and entertainers into the industry, and this again gave Rome the power to push the directors and even the owners out of the industry.

At first, Roman Catholics had little chance of becoming top stars unless they had British names, or changed their names, and kept their religious preference to themselves. Slowly the number of Catholic stars increased: Fred Allen (Sullivan), Barbara Stanwyck (Ruby Stevens), Ethel Barrymore, Loretta Young, Irene Dunne, Ann Blyth, Jimmy Durante, Rudy Vallee, Bing Crosby, Bob Crosby, Gregory Peck, Lawrence Welk, Gisele McKenzie, Jeanne Crain, Kim Novak, etc. etc. The Irish were the first to invade the industry: Arthur Godfrey, Dennis Day, Grace Kelly, Pat O'Brien, Margaret O'Brien, Maureen O'Sullivan, Dorothy Malone, Lucille Ball, etc. etc. They were

soon followed by the Italians: Don Ameche, Lou Costello, Perry Como, Frank Sinatra, Tony Martin, Dean Martin, Julius La Rosa, Sal Mineo, Vic Damone, Pier Angeli, Anna Maria Alberghetti, Rossano Brazzi, etc. etc. Rome is not only trying to organize these stars into a Catholic union, but it tries to organize everyone connected with the industry to the last cameraman. Such undercover designs to monopolize an industry which controls public opinion is a danger to a free society.

Roman Catholic mayors, governors, congressmen and senators are constantly used to further the political aims of Rome. Through the gangster element within the Roman church a secret Catholic party was set up to gain control of our cities. Tom Prendergast, a gangster who went to Mass every day, became the political czar of Kansas City. Mayor Jimmy Walker promoted the Catholic cause in New York City. James Michael Curley, mayor and political boss of Boston and governor of Massachusetts, served five months at a Federal institution until pardoned by President Truman in 1950. He has a son who is a Jesuit. Mayor Ed Kelly of Chicago; Ed J. Flynn, democratic boss of the Bronx, N. Y.; Boss Mayor 'I-am-the-law' Frank Hague of Jersey City, N. J. and many other 'bosses' have made the United States a Roman province. Frank Hague, for example, had the full backing of the Catholic hierarchy and kept his enemies, like John R. Longo, in jail on trumped-up charges. When Longo finally managed to regain his freedom, he received a wire from former Governor Edison which read: "Full and complete exoneration is yours after five long years of persecution . . . suffered under the pernicious political machine which for too many years has survived by imposing a dictatorship of fear and reprisal upon the people of Jersey City" (N. Y. Times, Feb. 18, 1948).

The days of these democratic bosses are over for no other reason than that they are no longer needed. Today, Rome seems to obtain her ends through the labor unions. Governor Brown of California — whose son is studying to be a Jesuit — defeated Knowland in the 1958 election by more than a million votes, as if the latter had been the greatest bum in the history of the U. S. Senate.

Getting back to the "dictatorship of fear and reprisal" of the old democratic bosses, the first thing it imposed on a city was a Roman Catholic police force. This police force controlled and

still controls the Catholic underworld and collects from it millions of dollars to perpetuate itself in office. It is not a coincidence that in Chicago, a city of prostitutes, bookmakers and gangsters, the Catholic bishop receives car license plate no. 1 to indicate that he is the first citizen of that city. Underworld slayings, though often forecast by our newspapers, are never solved by such police departments. Illegal gambling is exhibited publicly in the streets. Sometimes the Catholic police and the Catholic underworld clash when the first tries to extort too much money from the latter. "Three hundred of the city's biggest bookies," reported the New York papers, "shut down their telephone services and went on strike against the exorbitant shakedowns by police officials" (N. Y. Daily News, Feb. 7, 1947). Statistics show that in that year (1947) New York City was 79% non-Catholic, but its police force was 62.8% Catholic, while the higher-ups in that department were 80% Catholic. Once it is in control of a city, this gangster element makes the Catholic bishop its first citizen. It is an ordinary thing in New York to find 100 policemen at the steps of St. Patrick's during a society wedding or funeral, while not a single one at the door of Rockefeller Center. The cathedral holds 2,000 people, the center 70,000.

Not only cities, but Protestant towns and counties often have Roman Catholic chiefs and sheriffs. In places where mayors are elected and the chief of police appointed, the Romanists usually make a deal with the Protestant candidates and promise the Catholic vote if one of their men will be appointed as chief. In certain fields the chief of police has more power than a mayor and even more power than the President of the United States. It is a fact that every citizen and newspaper dares to attack the policies of the President and call him names, but no local citizen or local paper dares to attack the chief of police, unless City Hall and the papers and the public attempt to oust the chief in a united drive. Because of their power, these Catholic chiefs can perpetuate themselves in office and make a farce out of democracy. Like the bishops, who maintain a file of all scandals of their priests in order to keep them under subjection, most of our police departments in our bigger cities maintain files of men who have no police records but are potential, political opponents. Like the Jesuits, who own the state-controlled houses of prosti-

tution in Spain and secretly register their patrons, many of our police departments have and are still controlling our houses of prostitution and gambling establishments, and are using hundreds of detectives to trail political opponents. Wiretapping and bugging are the order of the day. Private detectives, invariably "ex-police officers" or "bad Catholics", have access, direct or indirect, to all police files and can blackmail almost any citizen. We have also a situation in Washington where only a handful of senators are still able to express their personal views without fearing the hand of blackmailers.

Our presidential candidates crawl on their knees before Cardinal Spellman imploring the Catholic vote. The one who will promise the most seems to get the vote. As Republicans and Democrats are about equal in strength and as presidents are elected to office often by less than one million votes, almost any minority can swing the election one way or the other. This may explain why overconfident Protestant Mr. Dewey lost the election, and why Protestant Mr. Truman, contrary to the Constitution and contrary to the wishes of 100 million of his fellowmen, sought to appoint an American ambassador to the Vatican.

Government by blackmail, character assassination and imprisonment are the typical methods employed by international jesuitry. Because modern political issues are so complex, it is not always easy to prove where the Jesuits are at work. Under the pretext of humanitarianism the New York Lincoln Square Slum Clearance Project was approved on Oct. 2, 1957, comprising 320,230 square feet at the price of \$16 per square foot. Soon after the project's approval the public found out about a deal which amounted to an indirect grant of \$3,500,000 to the Jesuit University of Fordham and another indirect subsidy of public funds to St. Matthews Roman Catholic Church, permitting these Catholic institutions to purchase this new property for only \$7 per foot, or \$9 below the purchasing price.

Some years ago the Federal Communications Commission refused to grant a Radio Station to the Mormons, because one of their board members was a Canadian citizen while the law forbids the granting of broadcasting privileges to foreign agents. This same Federal Commission granted the Jesuits of New York and New Orleans radio and television stations, though the Jesuit Order is an international organization whose members

are not free to choose or to keep their citizenship and whose totalitarian head is a Belgian citizen who resides in Rome.

Since Mussolini declared war on the U. S. and lost, our government has given more than two billion dollars to this conquered enemy. Recently the Senate passed a bill which marked \$964,199.00 of tax money to rebuild part of the summer residence of the pope, located in Italy proper. Christ warned the apostles not to live in luxury (Matt. 10:10). It is not our concern if a priest wants to live in a million dollar house, or wants to spend that much on one corner of his summer cottage; but it is a crime to confiscate this money from non-Catholic and non-Italian tax payers.

The land of Alaska, government owned, is rich in uranium and ore deposits. Some day Uncle Sam will have to sell it to private owners. The Jesuits, under the direction of a so-called "Glacier-priest", have been prospecting and surveying the land for decades. On Jan. 18, 1956 the House of Representatives passed without objections Bill #6376 which designates one million acres in Alaska for a hospital (a territory much larger than the whole State of Rhode Island). This hospital is to house 350 mental patients. The bill also gives the board of this proposed hospital such totalitarian powers that it could permanently dispose of any political enemy by declaring him insane. Not one of our representatives seems to care any longer why so much land is required and where it is located. It is not difficult to figure out what the next move of the Jesuits will be. Throughout our land public property is being donated or sold for a token price to Roman Catholic hospitals. Non-Catholic business men and public officials fear reprisals if they would dare to oppose these jesuit deals.

Hundreds of Catholic hospitals are being built, subsidized by Federal, State, County and City grants, donating two-thirds of the cost while the private owners of these hospitals are supposed to put up one-third. Staffed with 'slave-labor' (nuns), and filling each room with 4 patients at \$20 a day each, this too has become a gold mine. If motel owners without subsidy can make a living by charging \$5 for a room, hospitals certainly ought to prosper. Yet the nuns collect funds from private citizens and they organize bazaars, as if they were running a charitable organization of socialized medicine. Within one generation the

entire medical profession and the AMA will be forced to bow to the Church of Rome.

The balance of the religious population of New York City was upset by flying one million Puerto Ricans into that city and placing the unemployed immigrants on relief. Two million Mexicans entered by bus and train illegally into the States, and the secret promoters coined the deceptive name of "Wetbacks". Fifty-three per cent of our legal immigrants are Roman Catholics, while Senator Kennedy introduced a new Immigration Bill (S 2410) which would increase this number. Hundreds of Roman Catholics enter the U. S. above quota by the ridiculous method of a special Act of Congress. No one seems to raise a finger of protest out of fear of being called anti-Catholic and thereby losing the next election.

Secret Jesuits, disguised as Protestant laymen (about this later), have infiltrated our government offices, labor unions and other institutions, and seem to be able to use these public institutions to ruin those individuals and organizations which they were unable to subdue. International Jesuitry, through secret agents and stooges, is advocating merger of labor unions, merger of the armed forces, greater concentration of federal power, merger of news agencies, merger of magazines and local newspapers, merger of charity drives, yea even merger of Protestant denominations, because it is easier to control, intimidate or bribe one person in power than dozens of independent chieftains.

The Jesuits alone have founded 28 universities and colleges in the United States, no less than thirteen law schools, which turn out thousands of Jesuit-trained lawyers and other professional men who in turn must seek to infiltrate our local courts as judges, thus obtaining a legal hold on and control of our cities and Protestant towns. The National Catholic Welfare Conference has set up in Washington, D. C. a shadow government which is so complete with its own Departments of Education, Law, Press, Youth, Catholic Action, Social Action, etc., that it could take over our government at one minute's notice. A secret government within a government is the Jesuit's ideal, constantly pressuring our representatives and senators who are supposed to represent us. From a central government in Washington, D. C. all local Catholic organizations (press, law, school,

labor, etc.) are directed towards one goal: to place the government of this land in the hands of the Catholic Church. By organizing a secret 'Catholic Party,' the Jesuits plan to control all labor, all industry and all professions.

Even priests are being organized to play their part. Pope Pius XII made it clear that Romanism is not just a religion, but a political force as well: "The Church must reject, more emphatically than ever, that false and narrow concept of her spirituality, which would confine her, blind and mute, in the retirement of the sanctuary" (*Pius XII, Feb. 20, 1946*). The American bishops explained the pope's remarks: "The Pope wishes the clergy to enter politics, and not to confine themselves to the sanctuary. The idea that the church is not in politics is dangerous" (*Chicago Tribune, May 5, 1946*). Catholics are no longer to act like ordinary citizens, they are no longer to vote as Republicans or Democrats, but they must vote as Catholics: "The time has arrived when Catholics should not be blind voters in keeping with their long-time Democratic or Republican faith" (*Bishop John F. Noll of Fort Wayne, at Kansas City, Sept. 23, 1946*).

The entire history of the U. S. is being rewritten. Our founding fathers are no longer Protestants but Catholics. Many cities and churches in Arizona and New Mexico are now said to have been founded by Spanish missionaries as early as 1540, while in reality this territory was only visited by a small group of explorers looking for gold and silver. The usual story relates how Spanish missionaries in the 16th century converted the Indians, built a beautiful church with a tabernacle of solid gold and founded the town till they were driven away by hostile Indians. All golden vessels and church treasures were safely hidden in a cave before the missionaries fled. Some 200 years later (actual founding of the town) the missionaries allegedly returned, rebuilt the old church, but were unable to find the hidden treasures and gold mines. The lying pens of the Jesuits are exposed by hundreds of glaring anachronisms. For example, there were no tabernacles in 1540. The Roman Catholic tabernacle was introduced locally in Milan in 1575 (*Cath. Enc. 14, 424*), but the novelty received so much opposition that the custom did not become general till the 19th century.

Like the Communists of Russia, the Roman hierarchy in the

U. S. is rewriting our text-books. Authors and publishers who refuse to conform are unable to sell their material to Catholic schools and libraries. When one compares, for example, the editions of the Encyclopedia Britannica published before 1929 and after that period, one can see how a mysterious hand has changed a reliable reference work. Articles on Galileo, Inquisition, etc. were already written by Catholics and have remained unchanged. Hundreds of other articles: Pope Adrian, Albigensians, Antonelli, Democracy, Education, Heresy, Jesuits, etc., appeared after 1928 with a mysterious "X" at the close of the article, designating an unnamed reviser; latest editions omit it altogether. Under the pretext of preserving space this revision has been forced upon the American public, while actually much material has been added. The following sentences, for example, were erased: Pope Alexander VI: "Lucrezia lived with his mistress Giulia"; Arnold of Brescia: "At the request of the Pope he was seized . . . and hanged"; Pope Benedict IX: "rapes, murders and other unspeakable acts". How much space was saved by omitting these short sentences? What space was saved by changing Arthur of Britain from a mythical character to a real Catholic King? The article on *Reformation* lost 9 pages, but *Pottery* kept its 36 pages. The article on the Roman Catholic Church contains 10 pages of propaganda and falsehoods which have been refuted a thousand times. Under *Torture* this alleged neutral work of scholarship refers to a Roman Council of 384 which, according to the greatest Catholic authority on the councils, Bishop Hefele, was never held (*See Migne, P.L. 160, 66. Not in Mansi 3, 640; nor in Hefele 2, 40.*).

Legislation has been introduced to change the names of our off-shore islands in order to make them fit the legends and frauds of the Jesuits. Contrary to documented historical facts, Father J.M.J. St. Cyr claims that Abraham Lincoln received a Catholic education at home, because "the father and step-mother of Abraham Lincoln both were Catholics" ("Columbia," Feb. 1957). Even the history of George Washington is being rewritten: "He was a Catholic in spirit, so much so, that there is a warrant for believing that he became a son of the Catholic Church before he died" (*Boston Pilot, Feb. 21, 1948*). The Father of our country bluntly stated: "If the United States ever loses her liberty, it will be through the Romish Priesthood."

President Wilson warned: "Our liberties are safe until the memories and experiences of the past are blotted out and the Mayflower with its band of pilgrims forgotten; until our public school system has fallen into decay and the Nation into ignorance; until legislators have resigned their functions to ecclesiastical powers and their prerogatives to priests" (*Public Papers of Woodrow Wilson, authorized edition; New York, Harper, 1925, vol. I, p. 62*). We are now living under these conditions.

We have briefly seen how Roman Catholics have been organized from the bottom to the top, from innocent first-graders who illegally sell chances for Catholic institutions, to the Catholic underworld which with its local bishops control the governments and elections of our major cities, all working in their particular fields to make this country Catholic.

It is true that the average Roman Catholic farmer and laborer is a nice fellow and a loyal American citizen who hates to see his church enter into politics. As long as these 'simple' Catholics believe in Purgatory, Seven Sacraments, and other dogmas of their church, Rome is satisfied. But Article 22 of the Syllabus warns that those Roman Catholics who are professional men are bound by more than dogmas. Under pain of hell they must obey their bishops and diocesan statutes which have outlined the duties of each professional group.

23. Romani Pontifices . . . a
limitibus suae potestatis re-
cesserunt, jura principum u-
surparunt. 23. The Roman Pontiffs . . . have
exceeded the limits of their power
(and) have usurped the rights
of princes.

The thesis or proposition, here condemned as a heresy and falsehood, is an established historical fact. The Encyclopedia Britannica before 1929 under the heading *Heresy* once read: "As long as the Christian Church was itself persecuted by the pagan empire it advocated freedom of conscience." The Church of Christ was founded in 33 A.D. in Jerusalem (Asia), not in Rome (Europe). The city of Rome did not have a Christian community until 54 A.D., it had no bishop till 150 A.D., it had no church building till the 4th century when Emperor Constantine founded the Ecumenical Church with headquarters in Constantinople. As long as the Ecumenical Church existed (325-

1054) the Emperor himself held the title of Supreme Pontiff and the Church was governed democratically by an international council which functioned very much like the United Nations of today. There is not one authentic document which dates from the first thousand years of Christianity which makes mention of an alleged papacy of the Universal Church. During the first thousand years not one bishop of Rome ever claimed to be the head of the church, not one ecumenical council was held in Rome, convoked by the bishop of Rome, or presided over by a pope. Ecumenicalism and Papalism are opposites. After the Ecumenical Church split into two parts: East and West, the Western half began to call itself the "Roman Catholic Church" (first mentioned in history in 1059 A.D.) and became totalitarian. By forgeries, fraud, intrigue, assassinations, wars, and excommunications the popes subjected the rulers of the West one by one, and gained political control of Western Europe, falsely claiming their authority came from God. The papal power was shaken by the Protestant Reformation (16th century) and nearly destroyed by the democratic movements of the 18th century. Hence these vicious attacks by the Jesuits against both Protestantism and Democracy.

24. Ecclesia vis inferenda 24. The Church has not the power potestatem non habet, neque of resorting to force, nor has it potestatem ullam tempora- any direct or indirect temporal lem directam vel indirectam. power.

As we have seen, Rome claims the divine right to use force to win converts, to use confiscation and the death penalty to destroy heresy. It further claims the right and power to excommunicate and dethrone temporal rulers. In the Middle Ages the popes excommunicated and dethroned the kings of Europe, beginning with Henry IV. In post-reformation times they excommunicated King Henry VIII, Queen Elizabeth, etc., absolving their subjects from the oath of allegiance and refusing the Catholics the Sacraments of salvation until they had ousted or murdered their ruler. In modern times the Vatican overthrew the government of the excommunicated King of Italy and established Roman Catholic Dictator Mussolini without a shot being fired. It financed Roman Catholic Dictator Hitler in Germany. It overthrew, with the help of Hitler and Mussolini, the new

Republic of Spain and placed Roman Catholic Dictator Franco in power. It supported Peron in Argentina, and when the aging dictator amended his life and neglected his "obligations" towards the Vatican, he was excommunicated, and the head of the army (one man) overthrew the legal government by force and took the dictatorial powers for himself. As the usurper was not excommunicated, he clearly acted on instructions of the Vatican. Rome claims that she has the right to resort to the sword, to declare wars and to organize international armies of volunteers to suppress her enemies in holy crusades. It demands recognition as a secular power with diplomatic offices in all capitals of the world. It maintains the greatest spy system in the world. It excommunicates anyone who dares to maintain that the pope has no right to temporal power and to use physical force to obtain his ends.

The bishop of Rome became a secular or temporal ruler in the 8th century by pure forgery, fraud, theft and murder. All Roman claims, without one exception, are based on forgeries. For example, Peter, who was never in Rome, was made the first Bishop of Rome through forgeries attributed to Rome's first known presbyter, Clement. The "Clementine literature" (*Migne, P.G. 1*) is a huge forgery admitted today by all scholars. The Christian Church was not a 'visible' or internationally organized society till the 4th century, and its so-called "Apostolic Constitutions", which Rome swore for 13 centuries (350-1600) to be genuine writings of the Apostles, are now admitted forgeries (*C.E. 1, 636*). The "Donation of Constantine" and hundreds of other forgeries, first exposed by Protestant scholars, are now publicly declared to be forgeries by the Catholic Encyclopedia itself (*C.E. 5, 118*). So the temporal power of the pope is not by divine right, but by forgery. The so-called Papal States were stolen from the Lombards, a Unitarian group in Italy, to which the pope refers as "the most stinking race of Lombards, a race which by no means can be considered human, and from which the disease of leprosy originated" (*Migne, P.L. 89, 1254*). Pope Stephen III in 752 crowned the Frankish king, Pepin, and by means of a now admitted forgery, "the Acts of Sylvester," convinced this barbarian to come with his army to Italy, to drive the Lombards out, and to give the stolen property to the pope as 'his God-given right and possession'. Thus by

force, intrigue, theft and blood the Papal States came into existence and the pope became a secular ruler or king. When the armies of Pepin left Italy the Lombards returned and re-occupied their land. Then Pope Stephen fabricated a forgery under the name of St. Peter himself, and mailed it to Pepin. "I, Peter the Apostle, . . . protest and admonish . . . and under firm obligation conjure you . . . to save the beloved city of Rome from the detested Lombards" (*Migne, P.L. 89, 1004; Baronius 12, 601*). Flattered by this miraculous and celestial letter, and fearing the apostolic curse, the ignorant king once more came to Rome, and after a great blood bath, once more handed the stolen property to the pope. This is the factual history of the Papal States and of the Temporal Power of the pope. This papal crime is now called a divine right. Those Italian kings who gave this territory back to the starving peasants, were excommunicated. Those who protest the wealth of the church and demand land reform, are termed Communists. Till this day the Italian peasants must pay millions to the Pope as restitution for the Papal States of the Middle Ages (*Vatican Concordat with Mussolini*).

30. Ecclesiae et personarum ecclesiasticarum immunitas a jure civili ortum habuit.

30. The immunity of the Church and of ecclesiastical persons derives its origin from civil law.

Rome takes it for granted that its clergy are immune, and that no priest, bishop, cardinal or pope may be arrested and tried by civil authorities even though a civil offense like rape, murder, theft or treason has been committed. The issue here is not whether priests are outside the jurisdiction of civil authorities, but whether this existing custom is a special privilege granted by the State, or a God-given right defined by canon law. Those who maintain that, like the exemption from military services, the immunity of the Roman clergy is just a privilege which the State could revoke, are excommunicated. Those who dare to arrest the Roman clergy for any crime and those who dare to bring the clergy in a civil court, who dare to testify against them and who sentence them, are automatically excommunicated and become subject to the penalties for heresy. Neither a raped girl nor her mother can bring a guilty priest in court without excommunication (*Canon 2341*).

Like all Roman practices, the alleged immunity of its clergy is not of divine origin, nor of apostolic origin, but was introduced by fraud. The ninth century fabricated a document, called the Decretals of Isidore, now known as the "False Decretals" (*Migne, P.L. 130, 19*), which granted the clergy immunity from civil authorities and made them subject only to ecclesiastical authorities. For nine centuries (858-1650) Rome knew it to be a forgery but falsely swore that this document was genuine till the Protestant scholars of the 17th century exposed the fraud to the world. The Catholic Encyclopedia writes: "False Decretals . . . a collection of canon laws composed about the middle of the ninth century . . . Nowadays EVERYONE agrees that these so-called papal letters are forgeries . . . The Middle Ages were deceived by this HUGE FORGERY . . . the official edition of the Corpus Juris in 1580 upheld the genuineness of these false decretals . . . In 1628 the Protestant Blondel published his decisive study: 'Pseudo-Isidorus' . . . Since then the apocryphal nature . . . has been established as a fact" (*C.E. 5, 773*). It would seem that Uncle Sam still believes that Roman immunity is of divine origin, because it is afraid to arrest the Roman clergy while the Protestant clergy are dragged into courts and vilified in our newspapers. This is a strange situation in a country which is 80% non-Catholic and which boasts of equality. It would seem that we are no longer a democracy, but at the mercy of totalitarian pressure groups. When a so-called 'Protestant', self-ordained, independent and non-denominational minister sets fire to his church-barn in order to rebuild it, huge headlines appear in our papers from coast to coast: "Protestant Pastor sets fire to church to collect insurance." When a Roman Catholic priest commits murder or rape, the papers are silent and our police turn him over to his bishop. I know of a priest in Nebraska who raped a high school girl and was never punished by his bishop, because the scandal never became public. The little girl was accused of having seduced the man of God and was put in a Catholic institution; evidently out of fear for her baby she signed some papers, became a cloister nun before she became of legal age, and the hierarchy could rest assured that she never could reclaim her baby or bring public suit against the priest for the support of her baby. I know of a priest in Nebraska who stole half of the funds for a new church, but was

never tried in a civil court. He received life-sentence from his bishop and was placed behind bars in a Catholic nunnery. I know of another priest in Nebraska who stole the cemetery funds. I know of another Nebraska priest who was locked up in an ecclesiastical penal institution in Council Bluffs, Ia. and in Montreal, Canada, and when he regained his freedom he was found dead, shot through the eyes, in a hotel of Sioux City, Ia. Not one of the local or national papers mentioned his death. He was buried from the Cathedral of Omaha by the bishop himself, though canon law provides that a suicide must be refused christian burial. The Omaha papers described his funeral as if the priest had died a natural death. I know of a priest in Wisconsin who went on a drunk with the doctor's wife. Because the doctor committed suicide, the scandal became public. Because the priest had given 'public' scandal (secret scandal is quite permissible) he was put in a 'religious' institution, and his name appeared in the Official Catholic Directory under the Diocese of LaCrosse as being "on sick leave", without an address. Within two years this healthy, young and strong priest was listed in the obituary of the same Address Book. An almost identical case happened in Crookston, Minn. There are hundreds of criminal cases which never came before our civil courts, and there are hundreds of priests, though they had a right as American citizens to a trial by jury, who are now confined to the penal institutions of the Roman Church. The Official Catholic Directory under its more than 120 dioceses, lists about one thousand priests on sick leave without an address. Those who are actually sick usually have an address. It is difficult to liberate these prisoners because the institutions which house them have immunity from investigation, they do not keep records, they can transfer a man from one institution to another, they can and will deny that any person is kept there, and because of lack of proof on our part, they will bring libel suit against any informer. The idea that these imprisoned priests and nuns are insane is ruled out, not only because of their numbers, but because it is in no way 'religious' to keep relatives and friends away from sick people and to prohibit them from visiting the sick, buying presents for them and praying over them. Any U. S. official who would dare to raid these secret concentration camps would make headlines from Washington to Moscow for having dared to

invade the sanctity of a holy nunnery whose sacred constitution rules that no male may set foot within its gates except a priest. The raiding official could never be re-elected, nor would his life be safe for one minute.

Bishops who commit crimes or disobey orders, are locked up in the Vatican. When they make their quadrennial visit to Rome or are summoned for a 'promotion', they never know whether they will ever return to their homeland alive. A bishop of Los Angeles became "ill" in Rome and stayed there for years till they shipped his body back. On rare occasions the papers mention the imprisonment of Prelates. Bishop Jan Olaf Smit of Norway accidentally was mentioned in the papers because a Norwegian lady shot him in the St. Peter at Rome. Because Monsignor E. P. Cippico managed to escape from the Vatican dungeon and the Italian police had to be notified, his name happened to appear in the papers (*N. Y. Times, March 5, 1948*). Such publicity is the exception to the rule. The average American bishop can disappear in Rome without any investigation by our ambassadors.

Since our courts do not try the Roman Catholic clergy (except for cases which became so public that it could not be 'fixed'), our newspapers report only on criminal cases involving clergy of non-Catholic faiths. The propaganda value alone is incalculable. This is what is meant by the immunity of the Roman clergy, a custom which according to historical records originated in the 9th century, and which Uncle Sam, contrary to the Constitution which demands equality of religion, seems to regard as a "divine right". Those who dare to deny it are excommunicated.

31. Ecclesiasticum forum pro temporalibus clericorum causis sive civilibus sive criminalibus omnino de medio tollendum est, etiam in consulta et reclamante Apostolica Sede.

31. Ecclesiastical courts for temporal cases of the clergy, whether civil or criminal, ought by all means to be abolished, even without consultation or against the protest of the Holy See.

A See which is Holy ought to be immune to crime, but should not seek immunity for its admitted criminals. Yet any American official who should dare to defend our Constitution, who would

demand equality of religion, and who would oppose immunity for one privileged class, is *ipso facto* excommunicated, and no Roman Catholic may vote for him or have any other dealings with him. The same dogma can be found in many other papal Bulls.

32. Absque ulla naturalis juris et aequitatis violatione, potest abrogari personalis immunitas, qua clerici ab onere subeundae exercendae militiae eximuntur.

32. The personal immunity, which exempts the clergy from military service, may be abolished without violation either of natural right or of equity.

Pagan religions, long before Christianity, granted exemption from taxes and military service to its pagan priests because they had such a hold on the credulous mob that they could demand these privileges. Besides, they were few in number. The United States solved this problem by granting this ancient privilege to the clergy of all faiths. The clergy may volunteer for a commissioned post as chaplain, but cannot be drafted. Doctors have sought similar privileges, but the AMA is evidently not as powerful as the Vatican. Rome, however, reserves the right to draft its own clergy for preaching crusades or for instigating wars. It further claims the right to forbid its subjects to participate in wars which it may deem unjust or anti-Catholic.

The Jesuits always bring up the ridiculous argument that Roman Catholics are loyal citizens because they fought in two world wars side by side with the Protestants and their military graves are a testimony of their loyalty. No one has ever doubted that the average Roman Catholic farm boy is as loyal as a non-Catholic. The disloyalty and subversion is found in the professional groups of teachers, priests, judges, journalists, police, sheriffs, mayors, senators, etc., who by papal Bulls are bound to written and secret 'obligations' which are contrary to the interest of the United States and contrary to its Constitution. Sons of American Communists have also their military graves, yet this does not prove that every Communist is a loyal citizen. Catholic boys served in the army because they were drafted like all others and they would have been punished like all others if they had dared to evade it. A test of loyalty pre-supposes the existence of two opposite powers or directives. Here in the United States we have never had a papal directive forbidding

Roman Catholics to participate in a certain war, but Rome claims the right to do so. Until Roman Catholics receive from Washington and from the Vatican two opposite instructions regarding military services, their loyalty has not been tested, and we can only guess what the majority may do.

To get back to clerical immunity from military draft, the issue here is not whether the priest should be exempt, for this the Roman Church takes for granted. Rome excommunicates anyone who denies that the Roman clergy is exempt by divine right. If it were by American law it could be repealed.

37. Institui possunt nationales ecclesiae ab auctoritate Romani Pontificis subductae and plainly separated from the planeque divisae.

Schism and heresy are punishable by death. As the Jesuit Order was founded to exterminate Protestantism, the Dominican Order was founded to exterminate medieval heresy. St. Dominic preached the holy crusade against the Albigenses and Pope Innocent III (13th cent.) with the aid of an international army of indulged Catholics exterminated with the sword an entire denomination of over one million men, women and children. Such are the divine rights claimed by Rome. If the Catholic Church of the United States should wish to separate from Rome, as did the Catholic Church of England, the Pope could grant plenary indulgence to all Catholics of South America and Canada who joined the crusade for the extermination of American schismatics. Such a crusade could be quite successful if the President and the head of unified military forces were loyal Roman Catholics. Any Roman Catholic candidate for the American presidency ought to be asked what he thinks of these papal dogmas which enter the realm of international and domestic political affairs.

39. Reipublicae status, ut-pote omnium jurium origo et fons.

Like the Bull "Immortale Dei", this Bull condemns as heretical the American principle that all just power is derived from the consent of the governed, i. e. the people, and that all rights

of the citizens are guaranteed and all duties of the citizens are regulated by the laws of the land and by them alone, regardless of the racial or religious background of the individual. Nevertheless, a loyal American must hold that no special rights and privileges can be granted to certain minorities or classes by foreign or domestic religious leaders who claim divine powers.

42. In conflictu legum utriusque potestatis jus civile praevalet. 42. In the case of conflicting laws between the two powers (Church and State), the civil law ought to prevail.

According to Rome, every Roman Catholic in the U. S. has dual citizenship and dual loyalty, Catholic and American, and the latter is inferior. The same Pope Leo XIII (d. 1903) decreed; "If the laws of the State are manifestly at variance with the divine law . . . then truly, to resist becomes a positive duty; to obey, a crime" (*Encycl. Chief duties of Christian citizens*). 'Divine laws', of course, means the laws of Pope Leo. This pope also ordered Catholics to change their national constitutions and bring them in harmony with his constitution: "All Catholics should exert their power to cause the Constitution of States to be modeled on the principles of the true Church" (*N. Y. Herald, Nov. 7, 1885*). "The real glory of being a citizen of the United States is that it always comes second . . . Being a Catholic . . . comes first" (*Commonweal, Dec. 2, 1949; vol. 51, p. 231*).

No Roman Catholic President could uphold both the Catholic Constitution (*Immortale Dei*) and the American Constitution. No Roman Catholic judge could hold that the marriage of a Protestant convert (ex-Catholic) before a Protestant minister is both valid and invalid. Wherever there is a conflict between American law and Canon law, a loyal Roman Catholic is bound under pain of eternal damnation to repudiate our civil laws and democratic principles.

43. Laica potestas auctoratatem habet rescindendi, declarandi ac faciendi irritas solemnes conventiones (vulgo *Concordata*) super usu jurium ad ecclesiastican immunitatem pertinentium taining to ecclesiastical immunity, cum Sede Apostolica initas, sine hujus concensu, immo et ea reclamante.

taining to ecclesiastical immunity, without Rome's consent, and even against her protest.

All Vatican Concordats, whether verbal or partially in writing, are secret. All governments which maintain diplomatic relations with the Vatican, like Buddhist China or Shintoistic Japan, make some secret agreements and concessions, such as the immunity and protection of Catholic missionaries and other privileges, in return for which they receive some Catholic concessions, such as vital information obtained through her vast spy system. American diplomats openly advocate American diplomatic relations with the Pope, claiming that the Vatican maintains the greatest secret intelligence service in the world and that her information is essential for American security. Whether President Roosevelt cleverly sent a 'personal' representative to the Vatican, whether President Truman allegedly used the offices of Cardinal Spellman, or whether President Eisenhower appointed a Catholic 'convert' as ambassador to Italy, it would seem that some American presidents or presidential candidates have made secret concessions to Rome and maintained secret relations. Newspaper photos, showing the late Secretary of State Dulles (whose son is a Jesuit) or Vice-President Nixon bowing before the Pope, are not intended to get the votes of our Protestant citizens. We wonder whether these politicians believe in the Jesuit saying: "The Pope is either . . . the Vicar of Christ on earth, or he is an impostor with whom no respectable person should have dealings" (*Jesuit Weekly "America"*, April 27, 1940). Our government officials would not grant immunity to the Catholic clergy and prosecute the Protestant clergy, unless the United States had a secret concordat with the pope. If Protestant politicians can be forced into such un-American activities, what will Rome be able to do with Catholic politicians? Under pain of excommunication a Catholic president could be forced not only to honor all secret and illegal agreements made by former politicians, but to make many new commitments contrary to the interest of our country.

The political intrigue of the popes is as old as the papacy. First, by means of forged documents, the popes tricked kings

and emperors into bestowing great privileges and powers on them. Then, by means of false accusations and excommunications of rulers, by means of interdicts (depriving entire nations of the means of salvation), the popes were able to subdue the rulers of Western Europe, to subject them to feudal taxes (Peter's Pence) and to absorb their independent churches into the Roman Catholic Church. The political struggles between the popes and the rulers of medieval Europe (Henry IV; Frederick I & II, Philip IV, etc.) are historical facts, recorded in government documents and annals by contemporary medieval authors like Bishop Bonizo, Bishop Otto of Freising, Radevicus, Matthew of Paris, Aventinus, Villani, Glaber, Peter de Vinea, Albert Bohemus, Ferretus Vincentius, Berthold, Bruno, etc. etc. (See Migne, Muratori, *Monumenta Germ.*, Pierre Dupuy, J. L. A. Huillard-Breholles, Thomas Rymer, etc.). We should like to give a sample of papal intrigue by giving a short history of the Church of England and Ireland.

Pope Hildebrand (Gregory VII, 1073-1087) was the first Roman pope to attempt to rob the King and Church of England of their independence. He had circulated the 'tradition' that since the days of Charlemagne (787) the churches of the West had paid an annual tax to the See of St. Peter (Peter's Pence) and that the kings were to take an oath of subjection or fidelity to the pope (Migne, P.L. 148, 674). William the Conqueror (d. 1087), however, did not fall for the pope's lies and refused to recognize this Benedictine monk as his feudal lord. He wrote to the pope: "I have never, nor will I now swear fealty; because neither have I promised such, nor do I find that my predecessors did it to your predecessors" ("Fidelitatem facere nolui nec volo" Ep. 11 to Gregory VII; Migne, P.L. vol. 148, p. 748). In 1155, according to official British government documents, the Church of Ireland was still 100% independent from Rome, but Pope Adrian IV, the only Englishman ever to become pope (Lord Nicholas Breakspeare), made a secret agreement with his friend, King Henry of England, by which independent Ireland would become a feudal possession of Great Britain under the condition that both England and Ireland would recognize the pope as their spiritual head and pay the annual Peter's Pence. Such was the secret deal, but publicly the transaction was explained as necessary, because the Irish were too ignorant and

too unchristian to be independent. Pope Adrian IV wrote to King Henry II: "Ireland and all islands . . . which have received the teachings of the Christian faith, belong by right to Blessed Peter and to the holy Church . . . We are looking forward with pleasure to your plan of invading this island in order to extend the boundaries of the Church, to stem the wave of crime, to correct their morals and to stimulate virtues for the propagation of the Christian religion . . . to teach the uneducated and uncivilized people the truth of the Christian faith" (*Thomas Rymer, Foedera*, 1745 (3rd ed., vol. 1, part 1, p. 5).

The Rape of Ireland took place in 1155. The island was easily invaded, but not easily subdued. The Irish, unacquainted with a hierarchy, resented British appointed bishops and Roman customs. As late as 1172 Pope Alexander III wrote to King Henry II and mentions, among "other monstrosities and crimes" of the Irish, that "they all without distinction eat meat during Lent, nor do they pay church taxes, nor do they at all respect the sacred churches of God and ecclesiastical persons as they should" (Migne, P.L. 200, 883).

Before little Ireland was completely subdued to England and to Rome, the British empire itself lost its independence, as is the fate of all who get entangled with papal politics. On May 15, 1213, King John signed the British empire over to the Pope of Rome: "John, by the grace of God, King of England, Lord of Ireland . . . We offer and freely grant . . . to our lord Pope Innocent and to his Catholic successors the whole kingdom of England and the whole realm of Ireland . . . holding these lands as a feudal subject . . . and We swear fealty for them to our above-mentioned lord, Pope Innocent . . . Moreover, in proof of this our perpetual obligation and grant, We will establish . . . excluding in all respects the Peter's Pence, that the Roman Church shall receive annually one thousand marks sterling" (*Thomas Rymer, Foedera*, 3rd ed., 1745, vol. 1, part 1, p. 57). Pope Innocent III also forced King John to sign the oath of fealty: "I, John, by the grace of God, King of England and Lord of Ireland, from this hour forward, will be faithful (fidelis ero) . . . to the Roman Church and to my lord, Pope Innocent and to his successors . . . So help me God and these holy Gospels . . . May 15, in the 14th year of our reign" (*Foedera*, vol. 1, part 1, p. 58). The pope had first supported the British Barons against

their king, but as soon as the king was subdued he turned against the barons and condemned their Magna Charta (1215). German Emperor Frederick II well warned King Henry III of England (1228): "Take warning by the past . . . Did not Innocent III stir up the English Barons against King John, as being the foe of the Church? As soon as the King had crouched like a coward and handed over his realm to Rome, the Pope, who only hungered for the fat of the land, gave the Barons up to misery and death. . . . Unite yourselves then, and overturn this un-heard of tyranny, this danger common to us all" (*from the official government documents of Frederick II, collected by Huillard-Breholles; translation by T. L. Kington, History of Frederick II, London, 1862, vol. I, p. 298*).

It was not till 1534 that England was able to shake off the 320 year old Roman yoke, and to re-establish the independent Church of England. The popes then excommunicated King Henry VIII, Queen Elizabeth, and other British rulers and instigated plot after plot to assassinate them and to overthrow their government. Once Rome realized that it was a lost cause, she used the political situation of the Catholic Irish rebelling against their Protestant masters as a means to force England to maintain diplomatic relations with the Vatican. By papal concession England received the right to approve any candidate for an Irish bishopric before official appointment by Rome. Thus for purely political power Rome secretly betrayed the Irish Catholics once more.

The past is filled with Vatican intrigue, setting one country against another for the direct purpose of eventually subjecting both to Roman Catholic rule. We may not dwell here on medieval history, but we must turn to the 20th century. The first attempt by the Jesuits to revive the Holy Roman Empire was made in 1914 when Pope Leo promised to make the German Kaiser emperor of all Europe. The exiled Kaiser admitted in his Memoirs that "the Pope said to me on this occasion that Germany must become the sword of the Catholic Church." After this failure, Fascism was invented which is a Jesuit form of government based on the theory that people are not only too dumb, but also too lazy to govern themselves, and that they are satisfied when the government is placed in the hands of one they can call their own. By making secret deals with a blacksmith

in Italy, a paperhanger in Germany, etc., the Jesuits thought they had discovered the formula for re-establishing the Holy Roman Empire. Without a shot being fired the King of Italy abdicated and Mussolini with a handful of blackshirts marched on Rome. Mussolini signed a Concordat with the Vatican (1929) wherein he recognized the pope as the owner and ruler of the Papal States (extinct since 1870), promised to pay an annual sum from government funds as restitution for these States, created Vatican City as an independent State within Italy with the right to print its own money, stamps, etc., and recognized the Roman religion as the State religion, making it, for example, a crime for Italian businessmen to provide employment to priests who have broken their ties with the Church. Uncle Sam later recognized this unholy scheme of the Jesuits.

In 1933 Germany (Hitler) concluded a Concordat with the Vatican. Anyone can read in a neutral encyclopedia how the people of Spain, without any interference from without, orderly voted for a republican form of government, and how Catholic Hitler and Catholic Mussolini overthrew by force the democratic government of Spain and supplanted it with a dictatorship under Catholic Franco. Both Hitler and Mussolini declared war on the United States and lost. Yet, after the war the same intrigue continued. Spain (Franco) signed a Concordat with the Vatican (Aug. 28, 1953) and within one month Uncle Sam recognized the new government and signed a Spanish-American agreement (Sept. 26, 1953). This new Spanish government, hated by 90% of the people, allows public prostitution (government licensed), but outlaws public Protestantism. Protestants may only worship in privacy. Protestants converted from Roman Catholicism are unable to obtain a marriage license. Catholicism is the State religion. Yet these Protestant United States, under the pretext that we need Spanish naval bases, keeps this Catholic dictator in power by granting millions of dollars to this Spanish government, and then we wonder why the Spanish people don't like their Uncle.

In 1958 Catholic De Gaulle, by means of deserting French armed forces, blackmailed France into accepting him as absolute dictator, and President Eisenhower was immediately 'advised' to claim that he liked De Gaulle, and to publicly recommend a man who overthrew his legal government by force. To show his

appreciation to the Vatican, De Gaulle immediately pledged public funds for all Catholic schools.

By means of outright grants, so-called military surplus, and by loans the U.S. supports and keeps in power all the Roman Catholic dictators of South America against the wishes of its citizens. South Americans have charged that U. S. big business and even the underworld (casinos) have received favors from these dictators. It is no secret that Uncle Sam has interfered for years in the internal affairs of Cuba (Baptista vs. Castro), and when Castro emerged as the victor the U.S. news wires revealed the existence of an unholy alliance between U.S. big business and the Catholic Church, but most newspapers did not dare to print it (Jan. 28, 1959). When Catholic Dictator Peron double-crossed the pope and set up a popular government, the latter excommunicated him and by means of the Argentinean army overthrew the legal government by force. As the new (one man) Argentinean dictator was not excommunicated, Rome publicly approved this new government. When in January, 1959, nearly all of Argentina went on strike, the government immediately 'drafted' all labor into the army in order to make any striker technically a 'traitor' and subject to the death penalty. Argentine President, Arturo Frondizi, was hastily flown to the United States to tell President Eisenhower that "Argentina is a democratic country" (AP Jan. 19, 1959) and to obtain American 'aid' needed for suppressing Argentine labor. The U.S. has been interfering with the internal affairs of Venezuela by sheltering ousted Dictator Jimenez; of Guatemala by selling surplus fighter planes to those who wish to overthrow the government of Guzman, etc., etc., while we have imposed heavy tariff on such Latin democracies as Chile. The U.S. virtually confiscates the earnings of our Hollywood stars and sends this money to the Dominican Republic so that its tax-exempt, multi-millionaire dictator, Trujillo, can continue to rule his two million starving subjects and can send his son with a luxury 'warship' to Hollywood to buy the friendship of our actresses. The New York professor, Dr. Jesus de Galindez, an outspoken opponent of Dictator Trujillo, was kidnapped March 12, 1952, evidently flown out of the country and assassinated. Like all political murders of this kind, Uncle Sam has been unable to solve the crime. This incident further serves as a

warning to those who dare to obstruct the work of undercover agents who are secretly rebuilding the Holy Roman Empire.

The American public, kept by our newspapers in total ignorance about South American affairs, was surprised to learn that our dictator-praising Vice-president was almost assassinated during his 'good will tour' in South America and demanded to know why the marines were alerted to come to his rescue. The most shocking part of the whole Nixon incident was never divulged to the people. Because of a heart condition, President Eisenhower has confided all diplomatic secrets to his Vice-president. The incident exposed the fact that neither Eisenhower nor Nixon knew anything about our Latin American dealings concocted by jesuitical minds and executed by our State Department.

If it is true, as our diplomats maintain, that the Vatican has the largest spy system in the world, we must maintain that secret Vatican agents (Jesuits) are spying in our country, for without this their system would be far from complete. We may then also maintain that those Jesuit-trained American priests who were arrested and imprisoned in China for spying, might well have been spying for a foreign power as the pope claims to be. If our whole intelligence service depends on the Vatican, how dependable is the Vatican? Unless our agents and those of the Vatican are unable to track an elephant in the snow, it is unexplainable how our allies, Great Britain and France, without any travel restrictions, could prepare for an all-out war against Egypt without President Eisenhower ever finding out. The ex-general's ego was so hurt by his ignorance that he all but declared war against our allies in favor of Egypt.

Monsignor Tiso, who headed the Catholic Party in Czechoslovakia, betrayed his country by allowing the German army to enter it. Because the monsignor was not high enough in the hierarchy and the victors demanded some blood, Rome allowed him to be hanged as a war criminal. The Nuremberg war crime trials revealed that some of Hitler's best exterminators "were Catholic Sisters and nurses. The chief nurse confessed that she had murdered approximately 210 children . . . Another sister confessed with a stony grin that she had poisoned 'at least thirty to forty persons'" (N. Y. Times, July 5, 1945). Pavelic, who under the jurisdiction of Cardinal Stepinac headed the Catholic

Action group in Yugoslavia, attacked his country's army from the rear when Hitler attacked it. After the war Cardinal Stepinac was allowed to escape through the intervention of Cardinal Spellman, an American citizen who is up to his neck in foreign politics. Roman Catholic Andrew Artukovic, wartime interior minister in the Nazi puppet State of Croatia, who is known as another "Himmler" and whom the government of Yugoslavia demands to stand trial "for the mass murders of 200,000 Jews, Croatians, Serbs, gypsies and clergymen of the Orthodox faith in 1941-42" (*Belgrade, UPI, Jan. 18, '59*), was allowed to secretly enter the United States while the State Department refused to extradite him. Cardinal Mindszenty of Hungary, who is said to have spied for the Vatican and to have sought to overthrow the present communist government of his country, was given refuge in the U. S. Embassy of Budapest indefinitely. Why a Protestant country should give asylum to a foreign Catholic clergyman, dangerously engaged in politics, is not easily understood unless our government has secret commitments with the Vatican. The U. S. is now at the mercy of Communist controlled Hungary, because, if we break diplomatic relations with Hungary, the Cardinal will automatically fall into the hands of the present government which wants to try him for treason.

Rome either has a great spy system or not. She has foreign and domestic spies, or not. Her religious leaders are in politics or not. If the Vatican maintains numerous spies, as our diplomats claim she does, why does the U. S. allow these spies to pose as martyrs of their faith when they are caught in the murders of their own countrymen? As we have only scratched the surface of Vatican intrigues and of our own foreign entanglements, and commitments with this foreign power, it should be clear to all that the condemnation of Article 43 of the Syllabus is a very dangerous dogma.

45. Totum scholarum publicarum regimen, in quibus juventus christiana alicuius reipublicae instituitur . . . potest ac debet attribui auctoritati civili.

45. The entire control of Public Schools wherein the youth of a Christian State are educated . . . may and must be in the hands of civil authorities.

Whether it sounds radical, shocking or even sacrilegious, it is

Approved For Release 2002/08/21

60

a fact that all schools are to a great extent brain-washing laboratories. One can place the orphaned children of Protestant parents in a Catholic school and make believing Catholics out of them. The children of a capitalist will turn into Communists under Russian education. Whosoever controls the schools, controls the youth and the future of the nation. It is, therefore, obvious why Rome wants to control all schools, public and private, and why she forbids the State to govern the education of its citizens.

In Catholic schools the children are indoctrinated in the Italian branch of Christianity and in such philosophies as will benefit the political aims of Rome. In such institutions the minds of our future citizens are poisoned by having the priests (often foreign-born) teach them that our Constitution is anti-Catholic, that Uncle Sam is anti-Catholic for refusing aid to Catholic schools, that Catholics in conscience are allowed to withhold 10% of their income taxes because of this 'double taxation', that Catholics do not have to confess thefts which are less than \$50 if stolen from the rich, that Catholic employees may steal from their employers whenever they believe that they are underpaid or treated unjustly (doctrine of probabilism), etc. etc. Naturally the children of Catholic schools will not have the same respect for our Constitution and American traditions as those of the Public Schools. Yet for the sake of peace and religious freedom Uncle Sam allows these parochial schools to operate if financed by the owners themselves. The establishment of parochial schools is not a right, but a privilege.

Rome always has been and still is against the education of the masses, for it leads to democracy. An ignorant nation yields easier to totalitarian rule. For example in Brazil, which has the largest Catholic population (54 million) and where Rome is completely in control, there are no schools for the common people (75% illiteracy). The American Jesuits hold that "This business of teaching every child indiscriminately to read and write results in nothing more than mass illiteracy . . . The indiscriminate education applied to all alike under the State systems is the result of the heresy of the equality of man" ("America", Oct. 31, 1931; vol. 46, p. 83). In Protestant countries Rome is forced to maintain parochial schools in order to compete with public schools. Her aim is to control both and to destroy the latter. The methods

Approved For Release 2002/08/21

: CIA-RDP80B01676R003600070077-4

of destroying our public school system are many, and we can mention here only a few: (1) Without a shred of evidence, all public schools must be denounced as being atheistic and communist-inspired; (2) Public funds must be demanded for all private schools, so that other faiths will also withdraw their children from public schools; (3) Secret Jesuits and other papal agents, posing as laymen or even as non-Catholics, must gain control of the public schools.

We all know that a school can only be called atheistic or communistic, when such subjects as atheism or communism are positively taught, in which case any informed citizen must report the facts to authorities. A public school can no more be called atheistic than a public library, public swimming pool or public baseball park, simply because the Italian branch of Christianity is not being taught on its premises. The earliest American schools were 'Protestant', and the American Public School system was introduced (1825), not to further communism (invented in 1917), but to give education to all citizens, including Catholics. As soon as the American Public School became prominent, Rome attacked it. Whenever the Public School conducted Bible classes for its children, Rome accused it of teaching Protestantism and dragged the case in court; whenever the Public School sought to avoid religious controversies, Rome called it atheistic. That Rome is not sincere in her charges any educator knows. With all our public schools the United States has far more churchgoers and far less communists *per capita* than papal Italy. Neither are parochial schools *per se* more religious than public schools, because American statistics prove that the Roman Catholic Church with its largest number of private schools has always produced the largest number of criminals (*Statistics by prison chaplains, compiled by Father Leo Kalmer, "Crime and Religion", Chicago, Franciscan Herald Press, 1936*).

Rome would tolerate Public Schools if Roman Catholicism were taught in all class rooms and if all non-Catholic faiths were barred. She does not believe in the American system of barring all sectarian teachings so that the three R's can be taught to children of all faiths, leaving religious instructions to the churches. Our Constitution demands separation of Church and State; Rome demands separation of School and State.

The popes have condemned the American Public Schools since

their founding and the American Jesuits have denounced and vilified our American schools especially since the attack against the Public School by Pope Pius XI in 1929 (*Encyclical "Christian Education of Youth"*). By Canon Law Catholic parents must send their children to parochial schools (Canon 1374)*. Jesuit Father Paul L. Blakely, editor of the Jesuit Weekly "America", writes: "Our first duty to the public school is not to pay taxes for its maintenance . . . The first duty of every Catholic father to the public school is to keep his children out of it" ("May an American oppose the Public School", p. 5). The Jesuits of Fordham University in New York openly support the pope in his stand against our Public Schools, and teach that the pope has a right to condemn "neutral State Schools from which religion is barred" ("Social Ethics", thesis 85). Jesuit Father Francis P. Le Buffe shouted: "Thanks to our Godless American public school system, which is un-American, we have a generation that does not know God" (N. Y. Times, May 17, 1943). Bishop Fulton J. Sheen shouted over the radio: "A system of education . . . which teaches that there is no such thing as right and wrong . . . is not worth preserving. Let it perish" (Catholic Radio Hour, Jan. 18, 1942). Before his new assignment on TV, Sheen faithfully expounded the Catholic encyclicals and not only denounced our schools, but also the so-called rule by the 'mob'. The Jesuit Father W. J. McGucken defended the pope in his attack against our schools: "It would be absurd to say that the Pope approves of our public school system . . . No Catholic can approve of such a system where religious instruction is barred" (Catholic Way in Education, Bruce, 1934, p. 98). Bishop John F. Noll of Fort Wayne, Ind., wrote a booklet on "Our National Enemy No. 1—Education without Religion." So the attacks against our schools continue from coast to coast, day by day, by a minority determined to conquer our land. If one of the 140 million non-Catholic citizens dares to expose this jesuitical design of overthrowing our government, he is immediately singled out for character assassination and ultimate destruction. At the time Pope Pius XI attacked our schools, the New York Times still dared to sound a weak protest: "The Pope's encyclical sounds a note that will startle Americans, for it assails an institution dearest to them—the public school—without which it is hardly conceivable that

*Timothy Bouscaren (Jesuit), Canon Law, Milwaukee, Bruce, 1948, p.704.

democracy could long exist" (*N. Y. Times*, Jan. 13, 1930). Few Americans read these 'brave' words in small print. If our newspapers had had any backbone and true national pride, they would have headlined this papal attack and they would have reprinted President Wilson's warning: "Our liberties are safe until the memories and experiences of the past are blotted out and the Mayflower with its band of pilgrims forgotten; until our public school system has fallen into decay and the nation into ignorance; until legislators have resigned their functions to ecclesiastical powers and their prerogatives to priests" (*The Public Papers of Woodrow Wilson, authorized edition, part I, vol. 1, p. 62*).

"Public schools, public funds; private schools, private funds" (*P.O.A.U.*), is an old American principle. Not only does the first Amendment to the Federal Constitution forbid the use of government funds for religious schools, but many States forbid the same explicitly. The Constitution of Pennsylvania reads: "No money raised for support of the public schools shall be used for support of any sectarian school." In the New Jersey School Bus Case it was ruled that "The First Amendment has erected a wall between church and state. That wall must be kept high and impregnable. We could not approve the slightest breach" (*Decision of Feb. 1947*). Rome, however, seeks to breach that wall by playing on the sympathy and big-heartedness of our non-Catholic citizens. She first pretends to be interested in free bus transportation only, while hiding her real and ultimate aims. By portraying the Public School Bus as a 'Protestant' monster which refuses to pick up innocent Catholic children shivering in the cold, many Americans will feel that a child should not be made the victim of religious controversy, law or no law. Once Rome has her foot in the door she demands free medical care, free lunches, free text-books, etc., as stepping stones to her ultimate aim: total support of all her schools and destruction of the public school. As early as 1917, by a secret coalition with the Communist party and other minorities, the Catholic Party of Protestant Holland—which has a Protestant Queen—caught the Protestants sleeping and succeeded in passing a bill which gave them public funds for their private schools*. The Dutch government must pay the salaries of the nuns, the cost of the

*Bernard Vlekke (Catholic), *Evolution of the Dutch Nation*, New York, Roy, 1945, p. 331.

buildings, etc., but the government has nothing to say about the appointment of Roman Catholic teachers. The Roman Catholics of Holland were told to vote for all Communist-sponsored bills, in return for which the Communists voted for Catholic legislation. This is ordinary Jesuit strategy, for the pope has publicly stated that he will even enter into a league with the devil if it would benefit the Church. Rome needs public funds desperately, for she cannot compete with our big public schools which have better facilities (swimming pools, football fields, etc.) than her own. She knows that once she obtains public funds, Protestant denominations will demand equal privileges, and the large public school buildings which now dominate our American towns and which respect our flag and constitution, will then be supplanted by dozens of small denominational schools which she can easily control.

In order to obtain free city property for the building of a new Catholic High School, bishops have often threatened to close all their schools and to dump a hundred thousand Catholic children on the public schools. Officials should accept the challenge and let those children, who never before sought public education, wait till such new facilities become available. Society would benefit by it. The argument that Roman Catholic schools save the tax-payers millions of dollars and therefore their schools are entitled to subsidy, is neither a religious, nor a legal, but a very materialistic viewpoint. Since when has the saving of a few dollars priority over constitutional law? Counties and States could save their hospitals and old folks homes millions of dollars by introducing mercy killing, but this still would not make it legal. The same Jesuit logic could be applied to all private institutions, such as private libraries, private cemeteries, private swimming pools, Bible camps, wedding chapels and funeral chapels. Rome may use our public cemeteries, but if she dares to abolish her private Catholic cemeteries she will no longer be able to refuse 'christian' burial to those who refuse to accept her dogmas; she may use our city halls for her wedding ceremonies, but if she dares to abolish her church weddings she will be unable to dominate her subjects in matters of divorce or annulments; she may use our public schools, but if she dares to abolish her private schools she will no longer be able to corrupt the mind of her youth.

She has her own choice, but she has no right to demand public funds for the purpose of ridiculing our Constitution and destroying our democratic way of life.

MORE ABOUT JESUITS

The infiltration of Public Schools by Catholics for the purpose of destroying them, is one of the oldest schemes of the Jesuits. Before we can explain this, we must first explain the infiltration system of the Jesuits, a method so sinister, so evil, but so effective that the 20th-century Communists adopted the Jesuit method in its every detail.

Pope Clement XIV had demanded that these cursed Jesuits be extinguished 'forever'. When they were re-instated as a 'religious' order in 1814 (Aug. 7), they kept a secret group of under-cover men who were to infiltrate all branches of society. Governments feared their infiltration as much as that of the Communists of today. President Adams wrote in 1816 to President Thomas Jefferson: "Their restoration is indeed a step toward darkness, cruelty, perfidy, despotism, death. I wish we were out of danger of bigotry and Jesuitism" (*Writings of Jefferson, Montecello ed., Wash., D.C. 1904, vol. 15, p. 60*). "I do not like the reappearance of the Jesuits," explained Adams. "If ever there was a body of men who merited damnation on earth and in hell, it is this society of Loyola's." President Lincoln wrote to a friend: "The Jesuits are so expert in their deeds of blood, that Henry IV said it was impossible to escape them." It is as ridiculous to maintain that these American presidents were misinformed or anti-Catholic, as it is to maintain that Pope Clement was misinformed or anti-Catholic when he demanded the total extinction of the Jesuits. The Jesuits are not a 'religious' Order. The Saturday Evening Post speaks of them more correctly as "the Pope's Commandos," and says that this order was founded "along military lines" (Jan. 17, 1959). The Post further observed correctly that they are "the most feared, the most suspected" of all orders, blamed for many "wars, revolutions and intrigues", and "double talk." It further explains that not all Jesuits wear clerical garb at all times. "When a delicate assignment calls for it, he may confront the world in civvies." The same article finally explains that "Professional and business

men in many countries are conspicuous among laymen willing to work with the society, and Jesuit-sponsored groups of Catholic executives flourish in Germany, France, the United States, and elsewhere" (*Saturday Eve. Post, Jan. 17, 1959, p. 51*). This last statement seems to refer to Jesuit-trained agents and to "lay-Jesuits" who are to infiltrate all branches of society.

Dr. James J. Murphy, expert in jesuitry, wrote in 1946: "It can be said with the greatest likelihood that in the United States the following are lay Jesuits: Father Charles E. Coughlin; Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen; Senator David I. Walsh, head of the U. S. Senate Naval Committee; William T. Walsh, author; Robert Murphy, ambassador of the U. S. Department of State in Germany; Francis X. Woodlock . . . It is more than probable that Louis F. Budenz, recently resigned editor of the *Daily Worker*, is a lay Jesuit who was 'planted' in the Communist party" (*Converted Catholic magazine, Jan. 1946, p. 25*).

Our encyclopedias used to mention this secret group of Jesuits, but have been forced to omit this information long before the year 1928. Up to World War II the Jesuits denied the existence of any secret branch of activities. When Hitler had successfully invaded all of Western Europe and had practically restored the Holy Roman Empire, the Jesuits needed more secret agents and had to reveal some of their activities.

There are two kinds of Jesuits. The first wear black clothes and clerical collar, are occupied with serving a church or with teaching at a college, and give the impression of being ordinary priests. The second wear plain-clothes, deny that they are Jesuits, and are engaged in subversive activities of all descriptions. To them the end justifies the means and by special dispensation all things are holy. They may marry when ordered to do so. They may pose as Protestants and take membership in a Protestant church. They may assassinate a person when told to do so, and their vow of blind obedience forbids them to ask questions or to inquire why such orders were given. They are used as secret agents within their own country or as spies in foreign countries. They can be forced to denounce allegiance to their own country; or, as the Saturday Evening Post describes the Jesuit, "He may be ordered to speak henceforth, in another language, or change his nationality" (1-17-59, p. 46). They are usually not ordained, but trained in one specific field for one

specific purpose. A secret Jesuit, schooled for 20 years in the field of economics, sociology, psychology and public speaking, may be ordered to don a pair of overalls and to seek membership in a labor union in order to study its corruptions, its weaknesses and its structure from within, and to climb its ranks till he becomes its leader. Because of his learning, he will be able to outtalk any opponent; because of his unlimited funds he will be able to buy friends and supporters; his easy way of life (gambling, drinking, women) will impress the gangster element and other classes; his membership in a Protestant church or lodge will give him support from non-Catholics; his liberal or modernistic views will confuse the Communists; and his public but unexplainable support from the local hierarchy makes the Catholic element vote for him.

In the same manner the Jesuits have infiltrated the Protestant churches. Long before the 19th century they succeeded in infiltrating the State churches of England and Sweden, i. e., the Anglican and Lutheran institutions of these two countries. The 19th century introduced the so-called Higher Criticism of the Bible for which the Jesuits had no answer. Fearing that this new textual criticism might aid the wave of liberalism and democracy in Catholic countries, and knowing that the Bible is the sole rule of faith for Protestants, the Jesuits forbade the reading of books on Higher Criticism to all Catholics, but instructed their secret agents to teach that very thing in Protestant schools. As the Jesuits maintain a system of absolute secrecy like the Mafia (one secret member does not know the other), it is difficult to point to specific cases. When a secret agent has fulfilled his mission and is no longer needed in that field, he is often recalled and the world is told that he has been 'converted' to Roman Catholicism. Whether Newman of the Anglican Church, Budenz of the Communist Daily Worker, and dozens of other reported converts to Romanism were secret Jesuits, converts of secret Jesuits, or genuine converts, one is unable to prove one way or the other. We do know, however, that Communist Budenz, immediately after his conversion, was deemed qualified to teach at a Catholic university, and that Newman, created a Cardinal though all his works, both before and after his conversion, reveal his modernistic views on the Bible and theology, views which are neither Anglican nor Roman.

The number of Jesuits infiltrating a certain denomination is very small. It takes only one learned, popular or famous professor to contaminate an entire denomination. Jesuits, designated to infiltrate the political field of the U. S. A., usually pose as Episcopalians. Rome may feel that this church comes closest in doctrine to her own, and such agents can be trained in any English speaking country. Neither a religious nor a political agent needs to be a direct 'convert', but may be a third-generation undercover man. On the other hand, a Jesuit posing as a Protestant may be ordered to allow his son to become a Jesuit. The very thought that men no longer know whether they are voting or working for a Catholic or not, creates a fear which has been so psychologically effective in many revolutions. Some of our statesmen of the Episcopalian faith have been conspicuous for their lack of support of Protestant institutions and for their large donations to the Church of Rome. Since World War II and the rise of Communism in Germany, the Jesuits seem to have succeeded in uniting some German Lutheran bishops and Roman Catholic bishops into a fellowship which Martin Luther would condemn. In the United States the Lutheran churches seem too solid for the Jesuits to crack; while some other denominations seem to have been infiltrated not only by the Jesuits, but by the Communists and other isms as well. One denomination is being pulled to four opposite directions: Romanism, Communism, modernism and fundamentalism, while its founder stood for the last one only. One minister of a large Protestant church in Long Beach, Calif., invited a Catholic priest to preach his Lenten sermon and he introduced the speaker as if the whole Reformation had been a mistake and as if there were no theological differences between the two churches, or as if he had solved the problem of mixed marriages.

It is evident that dozens of our universities and Protestant colleges have been infiltrated by secret Jesuit agents, such famous institutions as the University of Southern California, the University of Chicago, Union Theological Seminary, Columbia University and many other Eastern institutions of learning. This does not mean that these schools are now under control of Rome, nor can it be said that their presidents are not the staunchest American citizens. In a certain sense it is a compliment for any organization or group to be marked for infiltration

because the Jesuits would not bother unless they thought them to be the backbone of our nation. The purpose of secret Catholic professors at Protestant or State institutions of learning is mainly negative. By means of these impostors Rome can pretend to have 'non-Catholic' or neutral support for her false claims and fraudulent activities. For every author who exposes the tactics of the Vatican she can order a 'Protestant' professor or an ordinary 'layman' to denounce his book as a vicious, anti-Catholic attack of distorted facts and malicious lies. She can order an 'agnostic' doctor to admit the miraculous cures of Lourdes. She can use an alleged 'neutral' news service to announce the miracle of our Lady of Fatima as Gospel truth, though reported some 40 years after its supposed occurrence. She can use 'reliable sources' of a foreign country to make our newspapers report the alleged appearance of Christ to the pope (of which the pope himself was ignorant till he read it in our papers), without our journalists going through the usual procedure of an interview, inquiring what Christ had to say. She can quote 'Protestant' scholars who will 'admit' as an indisputable historical fact that Peter founded the Church of Rome. Besides these immediate and indirect aims, complete control of the infiltrated organization is the Jesuit's ultimate aim.

Though probably less than 100 Jesuit undercover agents have been at work in the United States during the early part of the 20th century, it is evident that since World War II Rome planned to increase their numbers into the thousands. As few volunteers can qualify for the job of Lay-Jesuit or Vatican-agent and as ten thousands are needed, Rome was forced to give more publicity to some of her secret projects. Of late she admits that she has secret recruiting stations which turn out thousands of secret nuns and monks, people who wear civilian clothes but are bound by oath to follow blindly the directions of their monastery. This secret Order now admits to have been founded as early as 1791—the year our Bill of Rights was adopted—at the time when the Jesuit Order was outlawed by the pope himself. Its headquarters are in Chicago, whose Catholic underworld put Rome in power there.

In their magazine "America", the Jesuits came very close to admitting the existence of their "lay-Jesuits" or Jesuit-trained undercover agents, when they raised the question: "Can a

Catholic become a Methodist, a Presbyterian, a Mohammedan, an Atheist, and yet remain a good Catholic all at the same time?" This question was answered in the affirmative: "He can, if he is on the job of training a Catholic Evidence guildman" ("America," a Catholic Review of the week; New York, Nov. 30, 1940; vol. 64, no. 8, p. 198). A man who publicly denies his religion and Christ may remain a "good Catholic", but could not be much of a "Christian". He is merely a politician who holds that the end justifies any means. He is more interested in the numerical strength of his denomination and the political power of his pope than in honesty, the truth and the glorification of God. Instead of entering this country by a special Act of Congress, he should be told to leave. Instead of public funds and immunity, he should be given notice to register as a foreign agent Switzerland, which is regarded as the most liberal and tolerant country in the world and which has given asylum to all refugees, Protestants, Jews, dethroned kings and dictators, communists and anti-communists alike, has banned the Jesuits and consequently it has been spared from all foreign entanglements and wars.

Roman Catholic News services, under the date line: "Indianapolis, Ind. (NC)", revealed that we now have 6,000 secret nuns engaged in undercover activities. Evidently for the purpose of recruiting new members, the official diocesan paper of Pittsburgh, Pa., explained their activities as follows:

"Indianapolis, Ind. (NC)—Catherine S. is a bookkeeper for a large manufacturing firm not far from here. Thirty-five years old, Miss S. has been with the company for 12 years. She dresses neatly, likes music and occasionally attends a movie or stage play. She lives alone in a modestly furnished apartment.

What, you may ask, makes her newsworthy? . . . Catherine S. is a member of the DAUGHTERS OF THE HEART OF MARY, an unusual religious society founded 166 years ago. Although Catherine does not wear religious garb or live in a convent, she is a Religious—taking vows of poverty, chastity and obedience. . . Members of the Society who live a community life are known as 'INTERNS', while those who live in the world are called 'EXTERN'. Even interns in this distinctive society do not wear a religious habit.

The interns engage in apostolic activities such as STAFFING

SCHOOLS. The externs function to give a greater PENETRATION of the religious life into general society. In the ranks of the 'hidden' religious [nuns] are many prominent women. Some years ago, an extern won a national award without her identity as a religious even being remotely suspected.

Externs have been a part of the Daughters ever since their founding in France during the Reign of Terror. They formed, as it were, a 'FIFTH COLUMN' for God at a time when members of religious orders were being persecuted. They could carry on their work for Christ without fear of detection.

In its 166 years of existence, the Daughters have spread throughout the world. Membership is now more than 6,000 and they are found in 23 U. S. dioceses.

The main center for the Daughters of the Heart of Mary is at the Ephpheta center, 330 W. Wellington Ave., Chicago 14, Ill." ("Pittsburgh Catholic", Jan. 24, 1957).

Though the Externs of the Daughters of Mary infiltrate all offices and all branches of society, schools included, the Interns, likewise posing as civilians, specialize in infiltrating our public school system. By invading a Protestant county or State *en masse*, they gain temporary control of the Public High Schools, during which time Roman Catholic principals are put in authority. Once their task has been accomplished, this secret force moves on wherever directed to go. For example, in town after town in Protestant Minnesota, even towns with less than 3 Catholic families, one can find a high school with a Catholic principal, as if out of 140 million non-Catholic citizens no one can qualify for the best paid job in town. We find then the ridiculous situation wherein Catholic principals drive their own children every morning to a Catholic school of another town, deeming their own public schools not good enough for them.

Similar "Interns" turn up in our newspapers under different names. The Los Angeles Examiner, for example, explained that "six of the seven 'interns' now being trained under the new program at Immaculate Heart College are working in Los Angeles city high schools . . . They now hold regular teaching jobs under personal guidance of well-experienced members of Immaculate Heart" (*L. A. Examiner*, Oct. 20, 1957).

Not only secret nuns, but also secret monks are being trained by the thousands to infiltrate our schools and other institutions

for the direct purpose of destroying them. An interesting article appeared in the Catholic paper, "The Ligourian", which in seeking new recruits among teenagers explains the secret organization known as the "Secular Institute." Naturally the article does not too openly admit its political activities to non-members, but tries to give it a 'religious' twist:

"What is the Secular Institute? . . . A new vocation has arisen. This new vocation, this new form of religious life is known as the Secular Institute . . . A secular institute is a society of people living in the world and yet attempting to live up to the ideals and aspirations of those who are actual members of approved religious orders . . . In other words, the secular institute does the work of the nun and the monk without binding its subjects to the conformity and the community life of the nun and the monk. Take the example of the girl who belongs to a secular institute. She is in the world, oftentimes living at home, without giving the appearance of belonging to any special type of religious congregation at all. If one were not told that she is a member of the secular institute, one would never guess that such is the case . . . She would be one of the neighborhood in her appearance.

The primary purpose of the girl's joining a secular institute is to INFILTRATE the world with the teachings of Christianity and to do this in such a way as not to arouse suspicion on the part of those who have no belief in Christianity or at best a watered-down and false belief in Christianity, which unfortunately is the case of a large number of baptized Christians. The idea of the secular institute is to capture the world for Christ, without the world's knowing that it has been engaged in battle.

. . . Every army must have various kinds of troops—those who openly show themselves by uniform and action as the army of the nation; and those who generally promote the cause of victory silently and unknown.

. . . She is subject to her superiors in the central house of her community. She follows a particular kind of life, a life according to a rule, whether it be at home with her parents, or in a hospital as a nurse, or in a factory as a worker, or in a department store as a clerk behind the counter, only with approbation of her superior. She does nothing without either

direct or at least indirect approval.

... It is not to be thought that all the members of the secular institutes always live at home with their family; or that the work of the secular institutes is always merely to influence society by the example of right living and to infiltrate society with the ideals and the spirit of Christ.

Other secular institutes have communities, centers, homes where those members live (wearing the clothes of the people of the world, of course) who have no special reason for living outside the community. They may teach in public schools, ...

... Only one thing remains to be said ... the addresses of their headquarters which we list below.

OPUS DEI — Rev. Joseph Muzquis

Men's Residence
5544 Woodlawn Avenue
Chicago, Ill.

Women's Residence
4944 Woodlawn Avenue
Chicago, Ill.

MISSIONARIES OF THE
KINSHIP OF CHRIST
Rev. S. Hartdegon, O.F.M.
Holy Name College
14th and Shepherd Sts.
Washington, D. C.

(from *The Ligourian*, Jan., 1957)

SCHOENSTATT SISTERS
OF THE MARY OF THE
CATHOLIC APOSTOLATE
Sister M. Winfriede
New Schoenstatt, R.R. 1
Madison, Wis.

Here then, we have quoted from Catholic literature a few lines of black on white admissions that Rome through undercover agents is out to conquer the world by surprise, without the world knowing that it was in danger till it is too late. As it is impossible in the religious sense of the word to win a convert for Christ without the 'victim' knowing about it, Rome speaks here in a political sense. Hidden, Jesuit-trained monks and nuns, posing as Atheistic or Communistic authors, as Episcopalian statesmen, Protestant labor leaders, non-Catholic professors, Lutheran bishops, Methodist youth leaders, Baptist school teachers, Presbyterian secretaries for government offices, fallen-away Catholic sheriffs and even non-religious call-girls have been organized, Mafia-style, into an underground fifth-column with a striking force so fantastic that its victims will never know what hit them. It is apparently later than we think.

When Hitler spoke of conquering America, he admitted that this would be an inside job. Will America awaken in time?

Article 45 of the Syllabus actually demands that the entire control of our Public Schools must be brought into the hands of the Roman Catholic Church. Undercover agents, demanding public funds for private schools, are to bring about this change. Therefore, the American public must think twice before it changes its educational system. When Robert F. Creegan of New York State University in Albany proposes subsidy for parochial schools; when Dr. Charles J. Donahue, professor of Fordham (Jesuit) University in New York City, complains about 'double taxation' whereby Catholics "must pay their alleged 'double taxation'" whereby Catholics "must pay their full share in taxes to support a state school system 'which they sincerely feel is incompletely suited to the particular needs of their children'" (*Washington, D. C. AP, Sept. 1, 1958*); when George N. Shuster, president of Hunter College, New York, speaks of "the grotesque stupidity of Protestants" for opposing subsidy ("Catholic Spirit in America," p. 175) mark down their names so that you may know the enemies of our American schools and traditions. The issue of public funds for private schools is so important to the Roman church that politicians, like Joseph V. Aguiar Jr., are not ashamed to advertise in newspapers: "If elected, I will introduce a constitutional amendment, to force the state to pay 50% of the cost of all new parochial schools" (*Fall River, Mass., Herald News, Sept. 5, 1958*).

47. Postulat optima civilis societas ratio, ut populares scholae, quae patent omnibus cuiusque e populo classis pueris . . . eximantur ab omni Ecclesiae auctoritate.

48. Catholicis viris probari potest ea juventutis instituenda ratio, quae sit a Catholica fide et ab Ecclesiae potestate sejuncta.

Theologically the word "civil" is the opposite of "ecclesiastical".

cal", and may be synonymous with *secular, lay, non-religious, governmental or State*. As we have seen, Rome believes in education of the higher classes only and does not believe in the equality of men. Here, Rome warns the Catholic men (Catholic women, like the lower classes, have no equality) that in democratic countries the popular or public schools come also under her jurisdiction.

49. Civilis auctoritas potest impedi quominus sacrorum antistites et fideles populi cum Romano Pontifice libere ac mutuo commun-

49. Civil authorities may prevent the highpriests of religion and the faithful of the laity from communicating freely and mutually with the Roman Pontiff.

While admitting that she has the largest spy system in the world, Rome holds that her bishops and her plain-clothes agents are *ex lex*, that is, outside the jurisdiction of the State they live in, and their travel, to and from Rome, may not be restricted even in war time. Secret Concordats between the Vatican and other States cover these items here defined. Cardinal Spellman, who apparently appointed himself as Chief Chaplain of all Catholic forces of the U.S.A. (though he has neither the time nor the training for such a full time occupation, and merely distributes cigarettes), not only travels unrestrictedly during war time, but at government expense. During World War II, when Cardinal Spellman was to fly from Spain to England, Spanish officials prevented him the last minute from boarding a certain plane and gave the Germans the o. k. to attack the plane over the channel.

By solemn Concordats Roman Catholic Hitler and Roman Catholic Mussolini were in unity and harmony with the Pope: the first dictator was called "the secular arm of the Church", while the Pope called the second dictator "the Man of Providence". When this Man of Providence declared war on the United States, he was neither excommunicated nor reprimanded by the pope, but the Italian Church continued to pray for an Italian victory over its enemies, the United States. When Japan destroyed our navy by a sneak attack at Pearl Harbor, the Pope was so sure of an Italo-German victory that he immediately entered into diplomatic relations with our arch-enemy, Japan.

When our American soldiers invaded the North African continent in order to find a route to Italy, the Catholic hierarchy of the Allies had tipped off the Catholic hierarchy of our enemies, the Pope had tipped off Hitler, and the German armies were waiting for our boys. The massacre that followed is now history. War crime investigations, though almost totally censored where Vatican intrigue is involved, revealed at least this instance of treason. The N. Y. Times reported it as follows: "Paris, June 20 — Adolph Hitler was warned in August, 1942, through sources originating in the Vatican of the Allies' North African plans, according to evidence read before the examining magistrates today in the case of Otto Abetz, former Nazi diplomatic representative in France" (N. Y. Times, June 21, 1946).

According to Drew Pearson, Pope Pius XII and Cardinal Spellman talked every Wednesday at 1:00 P. M. by trans-Atlantic phone, all during the war; and although connections were made between two enemy countries (?), Spellman's conversation was never censored.

Roman Catholicism is an international religion. Therefore, in case of a world war, its members are found both among the Allies and among our enemies, and, as in the case of Spain, among the so-called neutrals. To allow these members to communicate freely is national suicide. In spite of the thousands of white crosses that mark the graves of our soldiers, Rome throws her anathemas at those who favor national security over wartime 'vacations' for our so-called highpriests of religion. The word 'religion' means the Roman Catholic religion. When the Protestant Bishop S. M. Molina wished to attend a bishops' conference in England, Spain refused him an exit visa. This was in peace time.

53. Abrogandae sunt leges quae ad religiosarum familiarium statum tutandum, earumque jura et officia pertinent; immo, potestas civile gubernium iis omnibus auxilium praestare, qui a suscepto religiosae vitac instituto deficere ac sole-

53. Laws which give protection to the status of Religious Orders and which deal with their rights and activities, ought to be abolished; yes, the civil government may even lend assistance to all who desire to free themselves from the accepted rule of religious life and to break their

nia vota frangere velint; pa-
riterque potest religiosas eas
familias . . . extingere.

solemn vows; and the govern- this plague of the Agapetae (nuns) to be in the Church? Whence
ment may also suppress these Re- come these unwedded wives, these new kind of concubines,
ligious Orders . . . these prostitutes . . . their real aim is to indulge in sexual inter-
course" (*Migne, P.L. 22, 402*). This Saint speaks of "Sisters"

There are about 2,000 ex-priests in the United States, hundreds of whom have been converted to Protestantism while large numbers of them are serving as ordained Protestant ministers throughout the country: Dr. Sommese, Dr. Fernandez, Dr. admirers of their own and may fetch a higher price in the Barrios of Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. Payas, New York; Rev. Burke, Atlanta, Ga.; Rev. Daly, Corpus Christi, Texas; Dr. Colacci, St. Paul, Minn.; Rev. Fredette, Nora Springs, Ia.; Rev. Zerhusen, Elkader, Ia.; Rev. D'Ostilio, Des Moines, Ia.; Rev. Ackerman, Miller, S. D.; Revs. Vinet, Sullivan, O'Gorman, McLoughlin, Mitchell, Foster, Adams, Borman, Connahey, LaVallo, Kieda, Groening, Florez, Mateo, Arrien, Beckes, Angulo, De Champlain, Cifuentes, Moschetti, Stuber, Zachello and hundreds of others. According to Roman Catholic theology, Rome has the divine right to put these Protestant ministers to death, and the United States has no right to interfere in these mass-murders. The greatest crime a priest or monk can commit in the eyes of Rome is not treason, murder or rape, but loss of faith in the Italian branch of Christianity. Hundreds of monks and priests whose consciences were bothered by non-biblical Roman practices and who made the mistake of confiding their inner struggles and convictions to their superiors, have been thrown in the dungeons of monasteries and left there to die. Monasteries are immune from investigation by civil authorities. To understand the monastery we must know something about its history.

When 4th-century Rome abolished paganism by law, it inherited ten thousands of temple dames, prostitutes and pagan "virgins" who wore the identical dress of the nuns of today. Hundreds of bearded tramps and hoboes roamed the streets of pagan Rome and were dressed exactly like the monks of today. Rome forced these pagan monks and nuns to embrace Christianity, but did not stop their immoral lives. Jerome (d. 420), famous Bible translator, Bible commentator, Father of the Church and Saint, who lived right in Rome, asked: "How come

the dress of the Agapetae (nuns) to be in the Church? Whence come these unwedded wives, these new kind of concubines, these prostitutes . . . their real aim is to indulge in sexual intercourse" (*Migne, P.L. 22, 402*). This Saint speaks of "Sisters" market of sin, merely because they are known as 'Virgins' and long like women, contrary to the precept of the Apostle (I Cor. 11:14); not to speak of beards like those of goats, black cloaks, and bare feet braving the cold. All these things are tokens of the Devil" (*Migne, P.L. 22, 413*). Jerome had no idea that this immoral group of eccentric monks and nuns were to become a standard feature of the Roman Church and would grow so powerful as to become its rulers. To rid the city streets of the ever growing pest and popularity of monks and nuns (*Mansi II, 963*), the first Western monastery was built, Monte Cassino (6th century), and an Italian desert dweller, St. Benedict (who was not a priest, nor ever attended church services, nor received the sacraments, but who, according to the Lives of the Saints, ran naked in the desert with dozens of naked virgins in order to 'harden' himself against temptation), was selected to become the first Abbot of the first monastery. From the very beginning the monasteries were used to imprison heretics, kings and political enemies. Within 50 years these immoral laymen and laywomen were not only admitted to ordination (priestesses, bishopesses; *C. E. 3, 484*), but controlled the Western churches. They who falsely claimed to forsake the world became its rulers. In 575 Benedict I became the first Benedictine monk to be made Bishop of Rome, and from 575 to 1075 thirty-three popes were Benedictine monks. The Catholic Encyclopedia admits the gross immorality of most of them (*under Benedict, John, etc.*). Speaking of the history of the popes from 754 to 1073, the greatest Roman Catholic church historian, Msgr. Duchesne, writes: "The Lateran (Vatican) became a resort of persons of ill-fame, and no virtuous woman could remain in

safety at Rome" (*Beginnings of Temporal Power*, 1908 ed., p. 224). Catholic Cardinal Baronius calls this period "the reign of the whores" (*Annales*, vol. 15, p. 501). Yet without these "whores" the bishop of a city (*urbis*) could never have become a religious ruler of the world (*orbis*).

Monks and nuns lived together as 'brother and sister' in the same monastery (*Mansi* 13, 755). By the 11th century the Abbots of monasteries had become bishops and worldly princes who raised their own families. The Benedictine nuns were so immoral that they were banned in nearly every country. Monksry was just about to die out when East and West separated (Schism of 1054), and Roman Catholicism was born in Western Europe. The Bishop of Rome made himself the dictator of the West and founded new Orders to exterminate heretics and to subject the Western kings. Peter Abelard (1142), St. Bernard (1147), Gilbert of Gemblours (1200), Peter of Limoges (1233), all of whom were Abbots of monasteries, admit the great immorality and sex crimes perpetrated in monasteries. The Council of Beziers (1233) reveals that the monks used "immoral and shameless women" and "public whores" (*publicas meretriccs*) to attract the peasants to their church carnivals (*Mansi* 23, 276). St. Bridget of Sweden (d. 1373), a reformer and founder of 50 monasteries 'for women only', relates that the monasteries are houses of prostitution, their doors open day and night. She calls the monks the "Mediators of the Devil" who are not ashamed of their adulteries, but "they are manifestly delighted in it, because their whores with swollen bellies walk with other women" (*Birgitta, Revelations*, bk 4, chapt 33). All councils, all church historians, all the Saints of the Middle Ages denounce the immorality of monks and nuns. All modern scholars of church history admit that the monasteries were used throughout the ages to imprison and torture thousands of heretics and political enemies (*Milman, H. H., Hist. of Lat. Christianity*). The Abbot of the monastery is king within his own domain, with the divine right to punish his subjects with torture and death. The Monastic Rule of St. Benedict prescribes excommunication and punishment for unrepentant inmates; if they still refuse to change their ways they are submitted to torture; "and if he does not even then amend . . . then the Abbot shall act as a wise physician (sapiens medicus) . . . then at last the Abbot may use the

surgical knife (ferro abcisionis), as the Apostle says: 'Remove evil from among yourselves' (I Cor. 5:13)" (*Rule of Benedict*, chapt. 28; *Migne, P. L.* 66, 520). Such is the immoral, criminal and sadistic institution of monasteries which claims immunity from civil governments.

Though white slavery under the cloak of religion is as old as religion itself; though young virgins were given by parents to monasteries without the consent of the virgins themselves (*C.E.* 15, 459); though orphans and illegitimate children of priests were forced to accept monastic life and used for immoral purposes (*Erasmus*) throughout the Middle Ages; it would seem that the idea of founding an Order of Nuns consisting exclusively of immoral girls did not originate till the end of the 17th century. One of the strangest Order of Nuns was founded in 1672 by a French priest, Father Eudes (a Saint, d. 1680), aided by his companion, a Parisian night club dancer, Margaret Alacoque (a Saint, d. 1690). These two not only invented the 'Heart-worship' of Mary, but "for female sinners he founded the Order of Charity, to recall them to a christian life" (*Roman Breviary*, Aug. 19). Instead of selecting nuns from the best families, this French Order of Nuns selected its victims from girls who were involved with priests and with other Roman Catholic bigwigs, evidently for the purpose of preventing their gross scandals from reaching the Protestant and democratic world. This Order, under various names, still exists today.

Miss Marcelina of the Philippine Islands, a pretty college girl who fell in love with Father Lallana and married him, relates how two nuns tricked her into taking a ride and how she was forcibly placed in a Good Shepherd Convent. Fearing the future of her baby, she signed her rights away under duress. Without court trials and by means of kidnapping, thousands of girls, nuns and priests have been whisked away from the world. Like dozens of others, Mrs. Marcelina Lallana succeeded in escaping and is now able to tell the following story: "I was requested to fill out a form wherein I had to certify that I was willing to stay and that I was ready to meet every and all conditions they would give. Actually, I was forced to sign this paper" (*Christian Heritage*, N. Y., Feb. 1958, p. 20).

A few years ago there was a riot in the Good Shepherd Convent in Montreal, where the inmates were "fighting police and

nuns tooth and nail for more than three hours" (*Montreal Gazette*, Oct. 9, 1945) in protest against what they described as "concentration camp conditions." Eleven girls, ranging from 17 to 20, were placed in strait jackets and locked up in jail, showing how police and nuns work together. Investigations further revealed that "no payment is given the girls, who work in the laundry and who make clothing for various firms which have contracts with the community . . . Children, who may be as young as eight years old, may never see their parents except through a grill of iron bars" (*Montreal Gazette*, Oct. 10, 1945). Investigations in jail revealed that the girls wore only outer garments, without a stitch of under garments, and they complained that they were forced "to say the rosary the whole day long, even while at work." Other charges: solitary confinement, use of strait jackets, poor food, etc. Had it not been for one alert newspaper, the incident would never have become public: "Provincial police on duty Sunday night failed to report the riot" (*Montreal Gazette*, Oct. 10, 1945).

In many penal institutions the girls are subjected to exhausting slave-labor till their spirit is broken. In many countries the laundries and Catholic printing shops of these tax-exempt institutions compete with private industry and fill the coffers of Rome.

Here in the United States we too have the "Good Shepherd Convents" and the "Magdalen Sisters", piously named after Mary Magdalene, the alleged public woman of Jerusalem. The Catholic Encyclopedia explains: "Magdalens, the members of certain religious communities of penitent women who desired to reform their lives" (C. E. 9, 524). This religious Order of holy nuns is subdivided according to moral standards into three classes: "(1) the Magdalens proper . . . admitted to solemn vows, (2) the Sisters of St. Martha, who . . . could not undertake the obligation of solemn vows, and (3) the Sisters of St. Lazarus, public sinners confined AGAINST THEIR WILL" (C.E. 9, 524).

"GOOD SHEPHERD, OUR LADY OF CHARITY OF THE—
The aim of this institute is to provide a shelter for girls and women of dissolute habits, who wish to do penance for their iniquities and lead a truly christian life. Not only VOLUNTARY penitents, but also those consigned by CIVIL OR PARENTAL AUTHORITY are admitted. Many of these penitents DESIRE

TO REMAIN FOR LIFE; they are admitted to take vows, and form the class of 'Magdalens', under the direction of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd . . . PRAYER, PENANCE AND MANUAL LABOR are their principal occupations . . . The Penitents', 'Magdalens', and 'Preservates' form perfectly distinct classes, completely segregated from one another . . . The Good Shepherd is a branch of 'Our Lady of Charity' . . . founded by Blessed John Eudes" (C. E. 6, 647).

Thus the Roman Church admits that in this modern space age there are American Nuns who were forced by judges, police chiefs, bishops or parents to embrace the Order of Father Eudes "against their will", while others who during their captivity or solitary confinement are said to have expressed a 'desire' to continue their penance and manual labor for life, are admitted to perpetual vows and thus lose their right ever to return to the world. Anyone who maintains that such institutions should either be outlawed or subjected to inspection by civil authorities is automatically excommunicated and delivered up to Satan.

When I lived in Nebraska during the late thirties and early forties, I became well acquainted with one particular Catholic Institution of which my former classmate was chaplain. If this institution still exists today, let me make it clear that my remarks do in no way reflect the present administration of this nunnery, nor the present administration of police departments, judges, courts, or anything else related to juvenile cases. My classmate was a man who felt very unhappy in the priesthood and consequently had developed into a drunkard. When drunk he would get into trouble with his sex activities and give public scandal. He was sent, therefore, on various occasions to penal (sometimes called *mental*) institutions in both Montreal, Canada, and in Council Bluffs, Ia. During the years my classmate served time in penal institutions he was listed in the official Catholic Directory "on sick leave", without an address. According to his own testimony he was considered unfit for church work, but he was allowed freedom if he would serve as "chaplain" for this Catholic institution. To appoint unfit or misbehaving priests as "chaplains" of religious institutions is common practice in the Catholic Church. The chaplain who preceded my classmate was a known sex pervert, who also had served time in Montreal, Canada. One day, under the chaplaincy of my classmate, the police

brought to the nunnery a thirteen year old girl who was working at a house of prostitution and had 'lied' about her age. As there is hardly anything which will escape an alert police force, this little girl was taken from this public house (the older girls continued their profession) and, according to my classmate, she was placed in this nunnery for discipline or correction. This embarrassed the chaplain, because he was a steady patron of the very house from which the girl had been taken. In the confessional the girl begged her priest to help her to escape and the chaplain came to me for advice. Knowing his background and knowing that he did not have the support of any pressure group, I warned him not to defy the Catholic Hierarchy and City Hall singlehanded. I left Nebraska soon after this incident, and not much later the chaplain, a Catholic priest, was found shot. Now, anyone who maintains that the U. S. government had a right around the year 1942 to investigate the dealings of this nunnery with various courts and police departments, is automatically excommunicated.

Numerous monasteries, never inspected by civil authorities, violate the laws of the land. Some monasteries forbid embalming and coffins, burying their inmates like dogs on the monastery grounds. The monk in charge of the monastery's infirmary often practices medicine without a license and causes many deaths by waiting too long before getting an outside doctor. Irregularities in death certificates are rumored to be numerous. Inspection of sanitary conditions, to which our smallest eating places are subjected, are usually unheard of. Inspection of places and persons, kept in solitary confinement, is considered heresy. Investigation of nuns, monks and priests confined to penal or mental institutions of the Roman Church (Council Bluffs, Ia.; Oshkosh, Wis.; Scranton, Pa.; Miami, Fla.; etc.) is considered so heretical that the mere mention of investigation is considered libelous. The transportation of American priests to the penal institutions of Canada (Montreal), especially when the crossing of the national border involves American detectives and police cars, certainly needs investigation regardless of papal anathemas. As monasteries in Spain and Latin American countries have been used to hide political criminals, to plan revolutions and to store guns for the overthrow of the legal government, our national security is at stake as long as we grant immunity to the insti-

tutions of this minority.

It is the duty of a democratic government of a Protestant country to see to it that its citizens enjoy freedom of religion and that no man, whether priest, monk or layman, can be put in a penal or mental institution for the 'crime' of turning Protestant. Yet Art. 53 of the Syllabus condemns this governmental protection. As our newspapers are deserting their duties of reporting 'all' the news, they are aiding the undemocratic cause of Catholic immunity. Even in cases of such famous and rich personalities as the Dionne quintuplets, our newspapers failed to report that one of them, Emilie, was scrubbing floors in an institution where priests 'on sick leave' were kept. Only after her mysterious death, when the public demanded some explanation, did our newspapers report that Emilie had talked her sister, Marie, out of taking the vow of poverty in Montreal (which might have cost the nunnery half a million dollars); that the two fleeing girls were picked up by Montreal police and handed over to the Cardinal; that Emilie had subsequently been placed in an institution to become a nun according to one report, and according to her own father she was there for a rest (a millionaire scrubbing floors); that there was no one at her bed side when she died; that she was not under doctor's care and that the local doctor was not called till after her death; that the local coroner was kept in the dark about her death until the bigwigs in Montreal had given him instructions about the death certificate; that the public was kept in the dark about her death; and that a big shot from Montreal announced the following day that she had died from epilepsy which the medical profession of the U. S. openly denied. When our newspapers refuse to report when a world famous girl enters a 'nunnery', what chances do American priests have to escape the penal institutions of Rome? Once in a great while the AP will report that a priest is bringing a million dollar suit against his bishop for trying to put him in a mental institution (as a case in Lincoln, Neb.), or it will report that a priest shot and killed his bishop for trying to lock him up (Rio de Janeiro, AP July 1, 1957), but our newspapers are afraid to carry these stories. The UP released the story of a priest "murdering his 19-year-old mistress" and "then used his knife to kill the child she was to have," and "admitted affairs with other women" (Jan. 26, 1958).

but few newspapers dared to print the facts. Thus, by fear, threats and anathemas our free press has disappeared and has opened the way for American concentration camps immune from inspection, if not by law, concordat or secret agreement, then at least by practice.

A priest or monk who comes to disbelieve Roman Catholicism and wishes to turn Protestant is designated by Rome as an "apostate". Rome claims the right to murder all apostates or to lock them up for life. Not even a Protestant government may interfere with her alleged divine rights. That is the meaning of Article 53 of the infallible Syllabus. If a priest or monk escapes, businessmen may not give him employment. In Italy employment of a priest is illegal: "Apostate priests or those incurring censure cannot be employed in a teaching post, or any office or employment, in which they have immediate contact with the public" (*Vatican Concordat with Mussolini*, 1929). Here in the United States it is easier for a man who served 30 years in Sing Sing to find and hold a job than it is for a man who served 30 years as a priest in the Catholic Church.

54. Reges et principes non solum ab Ecclesiae jurisdictione eximuntur, verum etiam in quaestionibus jurisdictionis dirimendis superiores sunt Ecclesia.

That kings and presidents of various countries are independent from the supreme jurisdiction of the pope is here condemned as a heresy of modernistic times. Hence the often repeated falsehood that a Roman Catholic President would not be under the power and jurisdiction of the pope in matters other than dogmas of faith (purgatory, sacraments, immaculate conception, etc.) is here exposed infallibly. Not only a Catholic President, but all Catholic governors, senators, mayors, attorneys, down to the school teachers and clerks owe complete obedience to the Roman hierarchy in all matters of public life, whether theological, political or legal. Any Roman Catholic, who holds an important office and disobeys his Church, is excommunicated, deprived of eternal salvation and declared an outcast for whom none of his fellowmen is allowed to cast another vote.

54. Kings and rulers are not only exempt from the jurisdiction of the Church, but are superior to the Church in litigated questions of jurisdiction.

55. Ecclesia a Statu, Statusque ab Ecclesia sejungendus est.

55. The Church ought to be separated from the State, and the State from the Church.

The pilgrims and early settlers came to these shores to escape the religious persecutions of Europe. If they had believed in a Union of Church and State they would have made the Protestant faith the religion of the State. However, in order to guarantee full freedom of religion to the small minorities of Catholics, Jews and others, and in order to set up a democratic government free from outside pressure, our forefathers demanded separation of Church and State, made it the law of the land, and added the first amendment to the Constitution (1791). Since then Rome has constantly condemned the American principle of Separation of Church and State.

According to Rome, all earthly powers are subject to the Catholic Church, but the Church is independent of the earthly powers, not only in matters of religion but in all fields. Writing on education, Pope Pius XI decreed: "Both in the origin and in the exercise of her mission as educator of the young, the Church is independent of any earthly power, not merely in regard to her lawful end and purpose, but also in regard to whatever means she may deem suitable and necessary to attain them" (*Enc. "Divini illius magistri"*). This pope's Secretary of State, Cardinal Gaspari, said in South America: "The theory of those who wish to separate religion from politics is erroneous and pernicious" (*Chile, June 17, 1922*). While Rome demands outright union of Church and State, the North American hierarchy usually softens the papal dogma by adding a jesuitical adjective to it: "Complete separation of Church and State is to be condemned" (*Jesuits' Fordham Univ. "Social Ethics"*, p. 92). When Hitler, as the "secular arm of the Church" began his war to restore the Holy Roman Empire, and Father Coughlin began his campaign to drive the Jewish and Protestant money changers out of business, Rome began to denounce more strongly the separation of Church and State in democratic countries: "No Catholic may positively and unconditionally approve of the policy of separation of Church and State" (*Monsignor O'Toole, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C., 1939*). During the war the hierarchy stepped up its propaganda. "Ro-

man Catholic theories of the church and state," warned Methodist Bishop Oxnam, "lead logically to a subservient state dominated by an absolute church" (*St. Louis Globe-Democrat*, Oct. 29, 1945). After the war the American hierarchy continued to denounce this American principle, as it stands in the way of the Catholic design to obtain public funds for its religious institutions. While the Supreme Court ruled that "The First Amendment has erected a wall between church and state" (*N. J. School Bus decision*, Feb., 1947), Pope Pius XII, without the use of limitative adjectives, denounced the American principle in 1947, but our newspapers were afraid to headline it. A foreign language paper in New York dared to come out with a blunt German headline: "Church and State inseparable" and reported: "Vatican City, Oct. 30. Pope Pius declared today . . . that the Church cannot be separated from the state" (*N. Y. Staats-Herold*, Oct. 31, 1947). The Jesuits denounced the American principle as "that negative, ill-defined, basically un-American formula, with all its overtones of religious prejudice" ("America", Feb. 15, 1947).

Like all members of the American hierarchy, Cardinal Richard J. Cushing of Boston denounced the American principle of Separation of Church. In early 1947, for example, Cushing was quoted by the N. Y. Times as saying: "The extreme development of the idea of separation of the Church and State is 'fantastic and un-American'" (Jan. 14, 1947). In 1949 Cardinal Spellman and Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt locked horns on the same question. When the latter upheld the Supreme Court ruling on the school issue, the Cardinal thought that he was powerful enough to destroy the former 'first lady of the land' by jesuitical character assassination and publicly accused her of discriminations "unworthy of an American mother." By daring to defend our Constitution we are in danger of becoming the victim of a jesuit smear campaign and of their well-known tactics of name-calling, like *anti-Catholic, bigot, atheist, communist*. In 1952, when the hierarchy became so outspoken on this issue, Methodist Bishop Oxnam thought it necessary to warn the American citizen once more not to permit the Roman Church "to get its prehensile hands in the public treasury."

In 1958, when the hierarchy began its all-out campaign to push Senator John F. Kennedy of Boston for the presidential

nomination of 1960, it suddenly changed its previous policies and attacks in order to lull the public into a false sense of security. Cardinal Cushing, who is Kennedy's bishop and who is pictured in Look magazine receiving a check of more than a million dollars from the Kennedys (Look, March 3, 1959), seems now temporarily cured of his former un-American utterances. The Los Angeles diocese reports that "Archbishop Richard J. Cushing of Boston said here that he had 'never met an ecclesiastical leader who desired union of Church and State in this country'" (L. A. Tidings, May 23, 1958).

Senator Kennedy, according to Look magazine, has said: "I believe as a senator that the separation of Church and State is fundamental to our American concept and heritage and should remain so . . . The first Amendment to the Constitution is an infinitely wise one" (Look, Mar. 3, 1959; AP Feb. 16, 1959). As the end justifies the means, Kennedy may say anything. We notice at once his autobisection: "as a senator", leaving room for opposite views. Governor Alfred E. Smith in 1927 made a similar statement: "I believe in the absolute separation of Church and State," but he pointed out: "I am only a layman . . . I am neither a lawyer nor a theologian" (Atlantic Monthly, April, 1927, vol. 139, p. 721).

The American public is thought to be gullible enough to believe that Senator Kennedy, who has rubbed elbows with the hierarchy from childhood, has no faith in the infallible teachings of his church. Once elected, a President Kennedy could claim that he had been misquoted, that the reasons for his former stand no longer exist, that he has changed his views like so many other presidents, or that at the time he was not aware of the fact that his personal views were contrary to those of Rome. We can feel sure that both the 'Creed of Al Smith' and the Creed of Jack Kennedy were drawn up by the hierarchy, i.e., by the Jesuits themselves.

That Kennedy's view is contrary to Roman theology is admitted everywhere. A famous Jesuit, Rev. Virgil C. Blum, of Marquette University, an expert in political science, told a small audience in Omaha: "It seems somewhat strange to see a Boston Catholic in the 'strict separation' camp, usually occupied almost exclusively by Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State and its adherents" (Providence

Visitor, Feb. 26, 1959). The Jesuit political scientist is barking up the wrong tree. He must know the address of Kennedy's bishop and of his pope. Why not expose the 'heretic' to them? His remarks are only meant to help Kennedy tear up his campaign promises, once elected. The same opposition against Kennedy's views were echoed by the Fathers of Notre Dame: "Assuming that many readers will mistakenly take this to be an official Catholic position on the problem involved . . . in our opinion such thinking contains a serious flaw . . . No man may rightfully act against his conscience . . . It is dangerous because it leads to secularism in public life. It is the political version of the belief that religion has nothing to say about the conduct of economic affairs. That you can separate your private religious convictions from everyday life" ("Ave Maria," *Cath. weekly, Notre Dame*, March 7, 1959). The diocesan paper of Providence, R. I., also attacked Kennedy's view which "seems to have pleased the POAU . . . more than Catholic opinion" (*Providence, AP* 2-27-59). Every Catholic paper seemed to rap Kennedy, except the paper which one would expect to expose the 'heretic', the Catholic paper of Boston. "Richard Cardinal Cushing said today: It is certainly ridiculous to suggest Sen. John F. Kennedy (D. Mass) might not be able to fulfill his oath of office because he is a Catholic. It's a great pity that questions about Kennedy's religion have to be answered at all" (*Boston, AP*, March 9, 1959).

It is useless to ask Kennedy what he would do if he ever would find out that his personal views were heretical and that he had incurred excommunication. Why should voters risk the safety of their country when there are hundreds of candidates whose loyalties are beyond question? How can we trust a man who claims not to believe in the doctrines of his own church and yet is a friend of the top officials of that church? Even if Kennedy took an oath that in case of a papal excommunication he would rather renounce his allegiance to Rome than to the United States, he would remain a security risk. We have a thousand years of Roman history: Rome never changes in her political designs. We must remember that neither Kennedy, nor Cardinal Cushing is authorized to define Catholic doctrine. Only the pope of Rome can speak authoritatively and infallibly. As long as he remains purposely silent, and refuses to annul the papal Bulls of his predecessors, we are just asking for

trouble when we vote the presidency of a non-Catholic country (80%) into the hands of a papal subject.

Pope Leo XIII warned the American bishops against the heretical or schismatic view that Separation of Church and State is only condemned in Europe, but may be tolerated in America, "for it raises the suspicion that there are those among you who conceive and desire a Church in America different from that which is in the rest of the world" (*Pope Leo XIII, "Catholicity in the United States"*, 1899). Rome fears man more than God. It is not guided by principles, but changes its political and religious views whenever expedient. For example, the hierarchy of Hungary, under Communist rule, now pretends to believe in Separation of Church and State. We would be foolish to trust a Roman Catholic candidate in the United States who is so ambitious that he publicly renounces the infallible teachings of his church for temporary expedience.

"Keep the Church and State separate"—President Ulysses S. Grant (1868).

60. Auctoritas nihil aliud 60. Authority is nothing else but est nisi numeri . . . summa. numerical superiority . . .

Article 60 condemns democracy itself as a heresy in which no Roman Catholic may believe. According to Rome, democratic rule is not of God, because it is a rule by the mob, an authority vested in the people themselves and measured by votes.

In his encyclical on human liberty, the same Pope Leo XIII remarks that "it is not wrong *per se* to prefer a democratic form of government, if only the Catholic doctrine be maintained as to the origin and exercise of power." This kind of double talk is more nonsensical than if he had said: Atheism is not wrong *per se* as long as it recognizes the pope as the supreme representative of God on earth.

Before the U. S. entered World War II (Dec. 7, 1941), when Father Coughlin was still preaching his fascist attacks against Protestant and Jewish individuals, the American Jesuits publicly attacked our form of government, identified democracy with Protestantism, and preached that such a government was not worthwhile to preserve or to fight for. Father Coughlin had predicted in 1939 "the end of democracy in America" (*Social*

Justice, Sept. 1, 1939), and by 1941 the Jesuits were so sure of a German victory that they began to reveal their real feeling towards our doomed form of government: "How we Catholics have loathed and despised this Lucifer civilization . . . Today American Catholics are being asked to shed their blood for that particular kind of secularist civilization which they have been heroically repudiating for four centuries. This civilization is now called democracy, and the suggestion is being made that we send the Yanks to Europe again to defend it. In reality, is it worth defending?" ("America", a Jesuit weekly, May 17, 1941, p. 145-146). Throughout the war we find that the Catholic hierarchy identified Democracy with Protestantism, and Protestantism with Atheism. As if totalitarian Fascism can be called a Catholic form of democracy, the American Catholics were told: "Democracy has never meant in Latin countries what it means over here, and enemies of religion know that Democracy has meant control of the Government by irreligious forces" (*Our Sunday Visitor*, national Catholic paper, June 6, 1943). By papal bulls Rome has explained over and over that only the pope can define what is right and what is wrong, and that it is blasphemy to leave such matters to the votes of the people. Bishop Sheen explained this Catholic view on his radio hours. Protestantism and its alleged offshoots of democracy, liberalism and materialism, are openly denounced as errors; and as error is wrong, neither democracy nor Protestantism has any rights. The Italian Jesuits explained it in their monthly as follows: "The Roman Catholic Church . . . must demand the right to freedom for herself alone, because such a right can only be possessed by truth, never by error" (*Civiltà Cattolica*, April, 1948).

67. *Jure naturae matrimonii vinculum non est indissolubile, et in variis casibus divortium proprie dictum auctoritate civili sanciri potest.*

No religion, least of all a minority, has the right to force her particular beliefs on others. Only when a certain religious practice is contrary to the law of the land will the U. S. interfere and uphold national law above ecclesiastical law, as in the case

67. By the law of nature the bond of matrimony is not indissoluble, and in various cases a so-called divorce may be granted by civil authorities.

of polygamy of the Mormons. In the same manner Roman Catholic practices which are contrary to civil law ought to be abolished.

Christ allowed divorce in case of adultery (Matt. 19:9); the Ecumenical Church, of which the Roman Church was a member from 325 to 1054, allowed divorce in case of adultery; the Greek Orthodox Church, the oldest Christian church on earth, still allows divorce in case of adultery; all Protestant churches allow divorce for the same reason, while people of other beliefs hold that divorce ought to be granted in any case of incompatibility.

Knowing that divorce destroys common family life and decreases the number of children, Rome today forbids divorce even where Christ allowed it. To accommodate the friends of the hierarchy, Rome has invented 30 grounds for annulment, a divorce in effect. Rudy Vallee, for example, had his three previous marriages 'annulled' by Rome and married his fourth wife in the Catholic church. It is the intention of the Roman hierarchy to make civil divorces of ex-Catholics and non-Catholics impossible by forbidding Catholic judges to grant them. Anyone who holds that the American courts are allowed to grant a divorce in specific cases is excommunicated from the Roman faith.

71. *Tridentini forma sub infirmitatis poena non obligat, ubi lex civilis aliam formam praestitutat, et velit hac nova forma interveniente matrimonium valere.*

71. The form (of solemnizing marriage) laid down by the Council of Trent under penalty of nullity is not binding in cases where the civil law has prescribed another form and where it holds that marriage is validly contracted by this new form.

73. *Vi contractus mere civilis potest inter Christianos constare veri nominis matrimonium; . . .*

73. A mere civil contract may constitute a true marriage among Christians; . . .

Marriage is no peculiarity of Christianity; it is older than Christianity. Neither the Bible nor the early Church looked upon marriage as a religious or sacred rite. Pope Callistus (3rd cent.) allowed society ladies to have intercourse with a

slave without the benefit of wedlock, he allowed the ladies to use contraceptives and drugs to produce sterility, thus "advocating adultery and murder" (*Migne, P. G., vol. 16, part 3, p. 3388*). Emperor Charlemagne (814) was the first to insist on a church blessing, but this ceremony was not a sacrament (*Migne, P. L. 112, 1169; 121, 146; 183, 271*). Not until Rome made marriage a Sacrament (12th and 13th centuries) were slaves admitted to church weddings. For 12 centuries Christian Rome not only had slavery but forced her christian slaves to live in concubinage. A local church with such primitive theology now claims to be infallible and to be divinely guided in matters of matrimony. Actually Rome made marriage a sacrament in order to control the private lives of the people from the cradle to the grave, and to control the private lives of the secular rulers. Rome now teaches that Christ Himself instituted the sacrament of matrimony, and that consequently no civil powers may interfere with her divine rights.

The American Catholic hierarchy holds, for example, that every baptized Lutheran who married an unbaptized Baptist in a Protestant church, is living in adultery and his children are illegitimate. Rome seeks to force legislation to prevent such and other marriages.

In Spain civil marriages are forbidden to those who were once baptized by the Spanish church. As nearly all Spanish Protestants are converts from Catholicism, they can neither marry in court nor in church, unless they forsake their Protestant 'heresy'.

Similar conditions exist in Italy. When an ex-Catholic lady recently married before a judge, Bishop Pietro Fiordelli denounced the couple as "public sinners", and he called the lady "a harlot and a concubine" unfit for christian burial. When the couple brought suit against the bishop, the pope howled holy murder, but the world was little impressed by his intolerance. Catholic Italy, therefore, has farther advanced in shaking off the Roman yoke than Protestant America.

76. Abrogatio civilis imperii, quo Apostolica Sedes potitur, ad Ecclesiae libertatem felicitatemque vel maxime conduceret.

76. The abolition of temporal power, which the Apostolic See possesses, would contribute greatly to the liberty and prosperity of the Church.

Praeter has errores explicito notatos, alii complures implicite reprobantur, proposita et asserta doctrina, quam Catholici omnes firmissime retinere debeant, de civili Romani Pontificis principatu.

Besides these errors, explicitly noted, many others are implicitly condemned by the proposed and asserted doctrine, WHICH ALL CATHOLICS ARE BOUND TO HOLD MOST FIRMLY, concerning the temporal sovereignty of the Roman Pontiff.

This article not only states plainly that this papal Bull is binding to all Roman Catholics, but it further reveals the fact that only part of papal instructions are put in writing while particular instructions for certain countries are delivered orally to the bishops and executed in secret.

77. Aetate hac nostra non amplius expedit, religionem Catholicam haberi tamquam unicum Status religionem, ceteris quibuscumque cultis exclusis.

77. In this our day it is no longer expedient to hold the Catholic religion as the only religion of the State, excluding all other religions.

78. Hinc laudabiliter in quibusdam Catholic nominis regionibus lege cautum est, ut hominibus illuc immigrantibus liceat publicum proprii cuiusque cultus exercitium habere.

78. Hence it has been wisely provided by law in some countries called Catholic, that persons who immigrate to these countries shall enjoy the public exercise of their own religion.

Conquered Italy, while occupied by American troops, removed the church signs from Protestant churches. Protestant employees of the American embassy in Spain may worship in private but may not announce their services publicly nor erect a public building of Protestant worship. The Spanish Charter of July 17, 1945, Art. 6, reads: "The Catholic religion, which is the religion of the State, has official protection . . . Open-air ceremonies or demonstrations other than those of the Catholic religion, shall not be tolerated." Uncle Sam not only respects these laws of Protestant persecution, but lavishes billions of Protestant dollars on these totalitarian dictators. According to the unanimous reports of American ministers who visited Russia and

Spain, there is more religious freedom in Communistic Russia than in Catholic Spain.

79. Enimvero falsum est, ci-
vilem cuiusque cultus liber-
tatem . . . conducere ad po-
pulorum mores animosque
facilius corrumpendos ac
indifferentismi pestem pro-
pagandam.

79. Furthermore it is false that the State's granting of freedom to all religions . . . leads more easily to the corruption of the morals and souls of the people and to the propagation of the pest of indifferentism.

Modern history has proved that State religions do not prosper like free religions. The United States, which allows Catholics and Protestants, Jews and Mohammedans, to immigrate and to worship God as they see fit, has its churches crowded, while Catholic Italy has nothing but empty churches and millions of anti-religious communists. Nowhere in the world has the Catholic church prospered as in the United States. Yet, American Catholics are forbidden under penalty of hell to uphold the American Constitution which proclaims freedom of religion to all.

"Individual liberty in reality is only a deadly anarchy" (*Pope Pius XII, April 6, 1951*).

"Freedom of thought, therefore, does not mean the liberty to think as one pleases . . . Freedom of thought means the liberty to think the (Catholic) truth" (*The Tablet, diocesan paper of Brooklyn, N. Y., Feb. 22, 1958*).

LINCOLN'S ASSASSINATION, 1865

The un-American, anti-democratic hate-Bull of Pope Pius IX was published during the last month of 1864 (Dec. 8) and copies were mailed to all bishops who ordered their priests to preach against our American principles. President Abraham Lincoln, elected in 1860 and re-elected in 1864 because of his stand against slavery, had become the symbol and champion of democracy so detested by the Jesuits. As the Jesuits hold that one can bribe or intimidate any ruler and that it is impossible to bribe the people, Rome has always opposed the democratic idea of granting liberty and self-government to all. International jesuitry sided with the South during the

Civil War, as this is evident from the apostolic letter of Pope Pius to the President of the Confederacy, Jefferson Davis ("Illustrious and Honorable President"). Contemporary authors, like Rev. Chiniqui and Dr. Fulton^{*}, quote Abraham Lincoln as follows: "From the beginning of the war there has been, not a secret, but a public alliance between the Pope of Rome and Jefferson Davis . . . The Pope and his Jesuits have advised and directed Jefferson Davis on the land, from the first shot at Fort Sumter." Lincoln's life had been threatened from the time of his Emancipation Proclamation to liberate the Negro slave (Jan. 1, 1863), and the new papal Bull (Dec. 8, 1864) pointed at Lincoln as the greatest heretic of this era. Lincoln wrote to a friend: "The Jesuits are so expert in their deeds of blood, that Henry IV said it was impossible to escape them . . . My escape from their hands, since the letter of the Pope to Jefferson Davis has sharpened a million daggers, is more than a miracle."

On Good Friday, April 14, 1865, Abraham Lincoln was shot by John Wilkes Booth. From the testimonies given at the trial of Lincoln's assassins, published by Benn Pitman^{*}, it is clear that the plot was directed by the Vatican which used a drunken fanatic to execute it. Headquarters of the plot was the house of Roman Catholic Mrs. Mary E. Surrat, 561 H Street, Washington, D. C. This house was a gathering place of Father Lehiman, Father Wiget and many other priests. Mr. Booth, who had a fanatic hatred for Lincoln, was easily persuaded that the assassination of such a man was not murder but a service to God and mankind. Mrs. Surratt was found guilty at the trial and she was hanged as an accomplice to Lincoln's murder. Mr. Booth fled to the barn of Mr. Garrett, a Roman Catholic. Mr. Lloyd, a Roman Catholic, was in possession of Booth's gun. Dr. Samuel A. Mudd, a Roman Catholic doctor who set the leg of the fleeing murderer, was sentenced to life imprisonment.

Thus the greatest champion of democracy (who gave us the definition of democracy: "for, by, and of the people"), the greatest citizen of the U. S. who towered over his fellowmen

^{*}) Rev. Charles Chiniquy (former priest and friend of Lincoln), *Fifty years in the Church of Rome*, New York, Revell, 1928. Rev. Justin Fulton, *Washington in the Lap of Rome*, 1888. Benn Pitman (court reporter), *The Assassination of President Lincoln*, New York, Funk & Wagnalls, 1954.

both physically (6 ft. 4 ins.) and morally, became the first victim of the anti-democratic Bull and was shot in the back in Washington, D. C.

History can and will repeat, for Rome still teaches that she has the divine right to murder any Protestant and that she will destroy any heretic if his death would greatly benefit her church. Thus, in a case where our President would be a Protestant (heretic) and our Vice-President a Roman Catholic, Rome could give an assassin not only permission to commit murder, but a plenary indulgence from all his sins for giving this country its first Roman Catholic President.

POLITICAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

Before Christianity all religions were national, and Church and State were united in such a way that the secular ruler was the Supreme Pontiff of religion with the right to appoint the highpriests of religion. This was also the case in the Hebrew religion. Because Christianity became an international religion, its clergy gradually demanded Separation of Church and State.

During the first 300 years Christianity was illegal and had no international organization or administration. During the era of the Ecumenical Church (A. D. 325-1054) the Eastern Emperor held *ex officio* the title of Supreme Pontiff and had the right to appoint bishops and to convoke councils. After the final Schism (1054) the Western Church (Roman Catholic Church) gradually succeeded not only in wresting from the Western Emperor his ancient rights of appointing bishops and convoking councils, but in taking the secular title of Supreme Pontiff for itself, thus subjecting State and Emperor alike to the Church.

"It is a fundamental human right, a privilege of nature, that every man should worship according to his convictions. It is certainly no part of religion to spread itself by force. It must be embraced freely, and not be imposed" (*Migne, P. L. vol. 1, p. 777*). These words did not come from the pen of Thomas Paine (d. 1809), but from Bishop Tertullian (d. 230), the very first Latin Father of the Church.

"Each of us should bring forward what we think, judging no man nor rejecting anyone from the right of fellowship, if he

should think differently from us. For neither does anyone of us set himself up as a 'Bishop of bishops', nor does anyone by totalitarian methods compel his fellow-bishops to the necessity of obedience, because every bishop (pastor), according to the allowance of his liberty and power, has his own proper right of judgment, and can no more be judged by another than he himself can judge another" (*Migne, P. L. 3, 1092*). "For neither did Peter . . . arrogantly assume anything to himself, so as to say that he held a 'primacy' (primatum)" (*Migne, P.L. 4, 423*). These words came from St. Cyprian (d. 258), the greatest Latin Father of the 3rd century, who unsuccessfully sought to unite all national churches into one visible church (*Cyprian, "On the Unity of the Church"*).

Pagan Emperor Constantine (d. 337) granted freedom of religion to all Christians: "We, Constantine . . . decided that . . . Christians and all others should have freedom to follow the kind of religion they favored . . . that each should have freedom to worship God after his own choice" (*Migne, P.L. 7, 267-268*). Later, when the Emperor turned 'Christian', he and his spiritual adviser, Bishop Hosius of Spain, founded the Ecumenical or Catholic Church and convoked its first council (325).

"Do not interfere in matters ecclesiastical, nor give orders on such questions, but rather learn about them from us. For into your hands God has placed the Kingdom, but the affairs of his Church He has committed to us" (*Migne, P.G. 25, 746*). These words, demanding separation of Church and State, did not come from the pen of Dr. Glenn L. Archer (P.O.A.U.), but from the first President of the Catholic Church, Bishop Hosius, who addressed them to the Emperor.

Gelasius (d. 496), Bishop of Rome and most ardent supporter of Ecumenicalism, sought separation of Church and State. He wrote to the Emperor that the bishops of religion should settle religious affairs even as "the imperial power has been bestowed upon you by Divine Providence, the priests of religion obey your laws" (*Migne, P. L. 59, 42*). Not even the first Western Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, Charlemagne (d. 814), granted this independence to the bishop of Rome. When secular rulers foolishly granted the Church independence from the State (Concordat of Worms, 1122), the State lost its independence from the Church.

CORRUPTION OF THE PAPACY

When the bishops of Rome became secular rulers (p. 45), especially after the first Schism of East and West (867), they forsook the teachings of Christianity and sought only power and wealth. Pope Formosus (891), who had been excommunicated by Pope John VIII, had the latter murdered and made a deal with the ambitious Arnulf to run the empire together. All subjects had to swear the sacred oath: "I swear by these Holy Mysteries that, saving my honor, my law, and the fidelity I owe to my lord, the Pope Formosus, I both am and will be faithful all my life to the Emperor Arnulf" (*Annales Bertiniani, A.D. 895; Muratori, R.I.S., vol. 2, part 1, p. 574*).

A Roman prostitute, Theodora, demanded the embraces of Bishop John of Ravenna, whom she made bishop of Rome (Pope John X, 914). When the pope quarreled with his concubine's daughter, she strangled him (*Migne, P.L. 136, 852*). Pope Sergius lived with the "whore" Marozia, who made her illegitimate son Pope John XI (*Liber Pontificalis, vol. 2, p. 243*). The Venerable Italian Cardinal Baronius (d. 1607) writes in his Church Annals under A. D. 931: "They elected to pope the very son of Marozia, named John, whom the same whore bore to Pope Sergius" (*Baronius vol. 15, p. 639*).

Cardinal Baronius calls this era of the papacy: "the reign of the whores". But the popes were no worse than their predecessors. Baronius quotes Genebrard to describe the popes of A.D. 752 to 901: "This century is unfortunate, as for nearly 150 years the popes have fallen from all virtues of their predecessors, and have become Apostates rather than Apostles." Thus he explodes the fable that there were just a "few bad popes". He describes these popes: "What a shame, what a pity. What monsters, horrible to behold . . . What evils did they not perpetrate, what tragedies did they not cause? With what impurities was this See . . . then stained; with what rotteness infected; with what filth defiled; and by these things blackened with perpetual infamy" (*Baronius 15, 501*). "And what sort of Cardinal Priests and Deacons were chosen by these monsters", asks Baronius (15, 572). The Catholic Encyclopedia answers that question: "The episcopal sees . . . were treated as property which descended by hereditary right from father to son . . . not

only priests but bishops openly took wives and begot children to whom they transmitted their benefices" (C. E. 3, 485).

What the greatest Catholic scholar, Monsignor Duchesne, says of these popes has never been said of the era of Al Capone or the Mafia: "The Lateran became a resort of persons of ill fame, and no virtuous woman could remain in safety at Rome" (*Duchesne, "Beginnings of the Temporal Sovereignty of the Popes, A.D. 754 to 1073," 1908 ed., p. 224*).

In order not to be accused of "smearing" the papacy, we will refrain from quoting Catholic scholars and quote directly from the Vatican Archives. Pope John XII (d. 964) "spent his entire life in adultery" (*Liber Pontificalis, vol. 2, p. 246*). The people of Rome cried out: "The Lateran Palace, which once was the meeting place of the saints, is now a public whore house" (*Migne, P. L. 136, 900*). The Roman Council (963) found the pope guilty of adultery "with the widow of Reynard, and with Stephanie, his father's concubine, and with the widow Anna, with his own grand-daughter, and he turned the Holy Palace into a brothel and whore house" (*Mansi, Cone., vol. 17A, p. 466*). "Pope John . . . while he was enjoying himself with the wife of another man, was struck dead by the Devil" (*Migne, P. L. 136, 908*).

Pope John XV (996) distributed all the wealth of the church among his relatives (*Liber Pont. 2, 260*), and was "covetous of filthy lucre and venal in all his acts" (*Muratori, Annali, 5, 498*). Pope Benedict IX, who was a boy of ten when he became pope (*Rudolph Glaber in Migne, P.L. 142, 679*), sold the papacy in order to marry. He still claimed to be pope during the schism (1054). "His life," writes Pope Victor III, "was so evil, so horrible, and so execrable, that I shudder to describe it" (*Migne, P. L. 149, 1003*). "He neither feared the Lord, nor respected his fellowman" (*Migne, P. L. 150, 817*).

A descendant of the whore Marozia, Countess Mathilda of Tuscany, made the monk Hildebrand pope of the entire West (Pope Gregory VII). He was the first Roman bishop to claim the sole title of Pope and Supreme Pontiff, but the bishops of the West dethroned him at the Council of Worms in 1076 (*Monumenta Germ. Hist., Leges, vol. 2, p. 44*). Slowly, country by country, the popes of Rome became the rulers of the West (see p. 54).

Pope Boniface VIII (1300) invented the Jubilee Indulgence and wrote the famous Bull "Unam sanctam," thus officially establishing the Roman Church as the only true church. Yet he was an outspoken atheist, a murderer and sex pervert. Both at the Council of Paris and at the Italian Council convoked by Pope Clement V, Pope Boniface was found guilty and condemned. At his trials, recorded in both Italian and French government documents, dozens of clerics and monks testified under oath that the pope had murdered his predecessor and many of his priests, that he denied the existence of life after death, that he held that "the three religions (Jewish, Christian and Mohammedan) . . . are human inventions", that Christ was a "hypocrite" and "a man like us", and that he constantly said: "to enjoy oneself and to lie carnally with women or with boys is no more a sin than rubbing one's hands together" (*Pierre Dupuy, "Preuves de l'histoire du differend . . ."*, Paris, 1655, p. 541; *Bishop Hefele, History of the councils, bk 40, art. 697*). Driven out of Rome, Pope Boniface committed suicide (*Villani, Historie, bk 8, chapt. 63; Muratori, R. I. S. vol. 13, p. 397*). This convicted murderer, atheist and sex pervert is the first Roman bishop to decree: "We declare, state, define and pronounce that it is altogether necessary to salvation for every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff" (Bull "Unam Sanctam," 1302; *Bullarium Romanum, vol. 3, part 2, p. 94; Mirbt, No. 372*). His successors became bolder in claiming that "We hold the place of God on earth," but they also grew more immoral than their predecessors. Their immoral lives have been condemned by all the saints of the Middle Ages, and their immorality is admitted by Catholic professors like Alzog and Pastor.

Pope John XXIII (not to be confused with the one elected in 1958) was held to be the "true" pope by the Council of Constance (1415), but, because of his great immorality, this pope was officially and infallibly dethroned. His personal biographer, Theodoric a Niem, informs us that John XXIII raped 200 women. We will stick to the official Vatican records: "His Lordship, Pope John, committed perversity with the wife of his brother, incest with Holy Nuns, intercourse with Virgins, adultery with the married, and all sorts of sex crimes . . . wholly given to sleep and other carnal desires, totally adverse to the life and

teachings of Christ . . . among the faithful of Christ, who knew his life and character, he was publicly called the DEVIL IN CARNATE" (*Council of Constance, Session 10; Mansi 27, 663*).

The Diet of Frankfort (1457) describes in detail the crimes of Pope Callistus III. When the immoral Franciscan monk, Pope Sixtus IV (d. 1484)—who had made his illegitimate sons cardinals and who invented the application of indulgences to the souls in purgatory—passed away from this life, the Roman newspaper said: "Today has God delivered his people from the power of this unjust man, who, destitute alike of the fear of God and of the love of his fellowmen, sought only the gratification of his avarice and ambition" (*John Alzog, Universal Church History, vol. 2, p. 903*). The same Catholic professor speaks of the children of Pope Innocent VIII, and of his papal successors.

Pope Alexander VI (d. 1503) had six illegitimate children, five by the twice divorced Countess Vanozza de Catanei, and one by the blond teenager, Giulia Farnese. His daughter, Lucretia, lived with him in the Vatican. Bishop John Burchard, who wrote the rubrics for the modern Mass and who was the official recorder of papal deeds, who lived in the Vatican and who was paid by the pope for writing it, recorded the life story of Pope Alexander, day by day. This bishop describes, for example, the intercourse party the pope staged in the Vatican on Oct. 31, 1501. The fifty ladies invited for dinner, later danced and played games in the total nude. The pope and his illegitimate daughter, Lucretia, personally awarded prizes to the nudists and later staged an intercourse contest, personally awarding the prize to the male guest who managed to have the greatest number of sexual intercourse with the ladies ("pluries dictas meretrices carnaliter agnoscerent"). One hundred persons at a time were engaged in fornication, right in the Apostolic Palace, publicly exhibited ("in aula publice carnaliter tractatae") (*Bishop John Burchard, "Diarium," Paris, 1885; vol. 3, p. 167*).

His successor, Pope Julius II (d. 1513) had three known illegitimate children (*Pastor, vol. 5, p. 369*), and the Reformation Pope, Leo X, was ordained at the age of seven and created a cardinal at the age of thirteen. We cannot give a full history of the popes, but we have given you a sample of what popes are

made of. Their murders and sins, enumerated by Catholic authors, are such that we are convinced that, though they have the same names as our Mafia, they were morally far worse. Ordinarily a voter is not interested in the immoral lives of religious leaders; but when certain leaders claim divine rights in the United States and hold 25 to 35 million American citizens in spiritual and mental bondage, we have a right to explain the papacy to our fellow citizens before they vote this papacy into power.

"Feed the flock of God . . . not by being lords over God's people, but by being examples to the flock" (*Peter*, I. 5:2).

"No one should be so foolish as to believe that it is the serious opinion of the pope and of all his Romanists and flatterers that his great power is of divine right" (*Martin Luther*).

WHAT HAS THE PAPACY CONTRIBUTED TO THE CAUSE OF LABOR?

What the papacy has contributed to the advancement of science, the emancipation of slaves, the emancipation of women, the cause of democracy, of freedom, of tolerance and of civilization in general, can be written down on one page. Neither has it done anything for labor. The papal encyclical "Rerum novarum" was actually anti-labor. When Rome knew that the labor movement could not be stopped, it began to form 'Catholic labor parties' to break the movement into religious divisions. Who controls labor, controls the country.

According to an article on the Jesuits in the Saturday Evening Post: "In the United States, labor relations now rank with the Jesuits' prime interests. The order operates a string of labor schools across the country, Jesuit specialists have sat on many arbitration boards, and Jesuit priests, working directly with the unions, are now a common sight on many a tough water front" (*Sat. Eve. Post*, Jan. 17, 1959, p. 51). By infiltration and merger the Jesuits succeeded in 'taming' labor in a country which is 80% non-Catholic. Naturally, some Protestant industrialists are the Jesuits' staunchest supporters. The Kennedys of Boston have been especially trained to cope with labor. While Robert Kennedy conducts the Congressional Committee of investigation in labor racketeering, John Kennedy is writing labor

bills: "Sen. John F. Kennedy (D.-Mass) today unveiled a new labor-management control bill . . . 'which would virtually put Mr. Hoffa and his associates out of business'" (*Washington, AP*, Jan. 20, 1959). Congressional Inquisitions often do not seek the criminal of a known crime, but at great government expense seek to pin a crime on a predetermined 'criminal'. Should the victim be without sin, his reputation has been ruined by implication, and he still can be put away, either for perjury or for contempt of Congress.

In his labor encyclical, Pope Leo XIII decreed: "Let it be laid down, in the first place, that humanity must remain as it is . . . unequal fortune as a result of inequality in condition" ("Rerum novarum"). The Jesuits, who wrote this papal encyclical, also interpreted its meaning: "It is not desirable that the workers in a State become part of the brain cell of its government. For the same reasons the cellular groups of different races cannot be allowed to mix in with one other" (*Jesuit Father Muckermann*, "Volkstum, Staat und Nation", p. 37). Such is the papal and jesuitical wisdom in matters of labor and race relations. The same philosophy is peddled by the lay-Jesuits in every field.

Westbrook Pegler quoted Pope Pius XII and Bishop Sheen to warn this nation against the danger of organized labor, and of the masses (mob) in general: "Pope Pius XII said that there was danger in 'the overwhelming strength of organized masses' . . . Fulton J. Sheen . . . said that all the good in the world now was threatened by 'the masses'" (*N. Y. Journal American*, July 18, 1945).

It is more than a coincidence that the United States has no 'Catholic' Labor Party, and that our Secretary of Labor, James P. Mitchell, is a Catholic who, like Senator Kennedy, Governor Brown, etc., is seeking the presidential nomination.

Jesuit-ridden Argentina controls labor by drafting any would-be striker into the army and by declaring any dodger a traitor to be shot before a firing squad. "Buenos Aires (AP) Jan. 20, 1959. The government's order drafting transport workers into the army appeared today to have broken the backbone of a nationwide strike against President Arturo Frondizi." While his country was on strike against the dictator who had overthrown the legal government by force, Frondizi flew to the

United States for financial aid to suppress the uprising. Rome considers any labor movement and any movement towards nationalism, independence and democracy as being Communist-inspired. Capitalistic America, instead of welcoming new democracies, is siding with the Jesuits, is destroying democracy abroad and is supporting and keeping in power dozens of corrupt Catholic dictators. Modern U. S. policy is dividing the world into two hostile camps: Communists and Catholic dictators, thus destroying its own Protestant heritage.

ANTI-PROTESTANTISM

A great threat to freedom and progress is anti-ism, i. e., character assassination of any non-conformist by falsely classifying him into a hate group or a group most hated. We are being brainwashed into believing that any opposition to political Catholicism is absolute bigotry and prejudice. While Rome may claim for herself alone infallibility and divine truth, and may denounce any Protestant Bishop, Jewish Rabbi, Tibetan Lama or oriental god-king as heretic, schismatic, unbeliever or impostor, we, non-Catholics, may not so much as disagree with the political opinions of Rome.

Protestants are not anti-Catholic. While Catholic countries close the doors of Protestant churches, Protestant America would gladly shed its blood to fight for the religious freedom of its Catholic brethren. The State of Minnesota, which is almost solidly Lutheran, was so anxious to show the world that it is liberal-minded that Lutheran Senator Edward J. Thye was defeated and Catholic Eugene J. McCarthy was elected as senator. Besides the Catholic mayors, chiefs of police, judges and governors, there are about one hundred Catholic members of Congress in Washington, D. C., more Catholics than any other denomination or religion. It is, therefore, evident that the Jesuits and their lay-stooges are going to call us anti-Catholic until we have sold our birth right one hundred per cent and have given Rome sole control. Even in the Al Smith campaign of 1928 the Catholics gave their candidate only 3 million votes while he received 12 million votes from the non-Catholics (*Catholic World, Nov. 1950*).

Nearly two years before the 1960 election, the 'Catholic-for-

President' camp began its name-calling and brain washing campaign to soften the American voter. A recent article in Look magazine cleverly tosses around such phrases as: "An old taboo of American politics", "the notion that only Protestants should be nominated for the top jobs", "the Protestants-only taboo", "the Protestant monopoly of the White House," etc. The author, of course, neglected to mention such 'taboos' as "native Americans only", "non-Communists only", and other precautions by which a free nation seeks to safeguard its freedoms (*Look, March 3, 1959*).

'Senator Paul H. I am a Protestant' Douglas felt it necessary to write an article in Coronet, entitled: "A Catholic can become President," and asks: "Just what could a Catholic President of the United States do — against the will of the non-Catholic majority — to aid the Pope?" He further warns that "we must not deny to 36,000,000 Americans the right to have a qualified member of their faith elected to the White House" (*Coronet, March, 1959*). The senator seems to think that an American President is just a figure head and does not seem to know that he is the Commander-in-Chief of our armed forces and exercises probably more authority than any other human being on earth. The senator seems to think that Catholics have a "right" to make Protestants vote for a Catholic president. No religion has a legal right to have one of its members in the White House. When the country elected President Eisenhower, it was not generally known whether he was affiliated with any church. He was elected by a landslide because his loyalty towards his country was believed to be beyond a shadow of a doubt. Even if the nation had elected Eisenhower because he was such a good "Protestant", what makes the Protestant Senator think that Catholics may take the religion of a candidate into consideration, but Protestants not? No American Catholic has ever been able to crash the Vatican in papal elections, why should he have a "right" to crash the White House? Which Catholic country votes Protestants into the highest office of the land? The Constitutions of Catholic countries like Spain, Argentina, Paraguay, etc., provide that the head of the State must be a member of the Catholic church, thus excluding all Protestants, Jews and candidates of other faiths. It would have been less ridiculous for a 'Protestant' Senator to have written to the Pope

and to have pointed out that among the newly appointed Cardinals not a single one was of the Protestant or Jewish faith. Because seven presidents happened to be of Holland-Dutch descent, it does not mean that now an Irishman has the 'right' to head the nation. Baptists, Lutherans, Mormons, Jews, Mohammedans, etc., do not take 'turns' in the presidency, but who-soever receives the confidence and the votes of the country as a whole, he is the man. To hint that 'Protestants' are prejudiced is raising an accusing finger at 80% of our citizens and totally ignoring the anti-democratic remarks of the leaders of the Roman Catholic Church. Dozens of brave non-Catholics have lost their jobs and millions of dollars have been spent in courts to keep the hands of the Jesuits out of the U. S. treasury, to keep them from using our armed forces, our stamps, our public highways for advertising their brand of religion. How long can we keep it up, Senator Douglas, and what will they think of under a Catholic administration?

Why did not the "Protestant" Senator give *his* job to a Catholic? Any honest or informed man would rather have pointed out how anti-democratic, anti-social and anti-Protestant the Roman Catholic Church is, but Senator Douglas undoubtedly considers that 'taboo' and 'prejudice'.

"Make America Catholic" read the huge banner which the Paulist Fathers displayed in the streets of downtown New York City. "The time has arrived when Catholics should not be blind voters in keeping with their longtime Democratic and Republican faith," shouted Bishop Noll in Kansas City. Jesuit Father Francis X. Talbot predicted the doom of American civilization when he said: "The old Protestant culture is about at the end of its rope. The first settlers of our country established this distinctly Protestant culture . . . It has given the complexion to this country, entered our legislation, sociology and economics, is the basis of our commerce and industry, and, in fact, has formed a great part of the American people . . . This Christian culture is a wave receding, and we Catholics are living in a most important day, with one culture vanishing, another gaining strength. Why can't we raise the tidal wave that will bring Catholic culture into the United States? Why can't we make the United States Catholic in legislation, Catholic in justice, aims and ideals? . . . We are now ready to expand. Now is the time

to organize and strike hard to put the Catholic idea before all" (*New York World*, Dec. 14, 1930). "How we Catholics have loathed and despised this Lucifer civilization . . . This civilization is now called democracy" (*America, Jesuit weekly*, May 17, 1941).

These men, who despise our American way of life, are seeking power to destroy us. These are the men who by some mysterious charm can persuade even a 'Protestant' senator to turn against his own people. As we have seen, these men do not tolerate other religions besides their own. They are anti-Protestant not only where they are in a majority, but where they enjoy the greatest freedom as a minority. The Archbishop of Santa Fe, N. M., succeeded in ousting every Protestant from the Santa Fe School board (*Presbyterian Life*, Aug. 15, 1958). What will these bishops be able to do under Catholic leadership? As we have shown, these men are intolerant, and boast that they may not tolerate evil and error (*Protestantism*) in their midst. They are anti-Public School, anti-State, anti-equality, anti-democratic and anti-social in all their actions. Bishop John O'Hara of Buffalo laid down this generally accepted rule for Catholic school children: "First of all, Catholics are not permitted to attend baccalaureate or commencement services held in a non-Catholic church. Secondly Catholics are not permitted to attend a Protestant service held anywhere . . . even though the priest is requested to give the sermon" (*Buffalo Chancery*, March, 1947). "The real glory of being a citizen of the United States is that it always comes second . . . Being a Catholic . . . comes first" (*Commonweal*, Dec. 2, 1949; vol. 51, p. 231).

Thus a majority is pleading with a minority just to practice a little bit of tolerance and charity, and to do unto others as they would like to be treated. But they flatly refuse to accept our American ideals and openly advocate to overthrow them.

CATHOLIC VICTORY IN 1960?

The chances of a Democratic victory look very good, with or without a Catholic candidate. If the Republicans should nominate Nixon and Mrs. Clare Booth Luce for Vice-President, the Catholics will get their foot in the White House either way.

Our newspapers and national magazines seem to have completely surrendered to Catholic pressure. Labor seems to have surrendered to the Roman yoke. There are indications that Rome has been assured of the vote of some minorities.

Of the 16 million Negroes in the U. S. about 15% million are Protestant. Rome was not interested in this poor segment of our population until the National Association for the Advancement of the Colored People began to organize them into a political group. Very few Negroes have joined the NAACP, but nearly all are expected to follow its political directions. The Jesuits have never been pro-Negro, and political organizations of the Catholic Church, like the Knights of Columbus, have barred Negroes from membership, even in the North (*Time*, Sept. 15, 1958). Unless the NAACP can believe that it was the Roman hierarchy which kept the Little Rock incident on our front pages, it should not support a Catholic president. Yet Rome may succeed in convincing an oppressed group to vote for another minority group, just out of principle.

Of the 5 million Jews in the U. S. some may feel sympathetic towards a new adventure in electing a president not by party, but by faith. Pope Innocent III (1215) forbade the Jews to run for public office and forced them to wear a special garb (*Mansi* 22, 1055). The Jesuits selected Catholic Hitler to introduce the same and worse customs for their new Holy Roman Empire. It is hard to believe that Jewish leadership will encourage the support of a Catholic candidate simply because Catholicism is sometimes called a minority.

The American people will realize that Catholics have a habit of staying in power once they gain it. Their methods of boycott, censure, pressure and blackmail will perpetuate them in power. Public funds will start flowing into Catholic enterprises. Once the State begins to subsidize parochial schools, Rome is in business. Catholic schools, hospitals, churches, etc., do not belong to the Catholic population but to the bishop alone. He is a one-man organization, incorporated as such by special privilege ("corporation sole"). Without having to bother with the wishes of the people or with the votes of a board of trustees, the bishop can start any private enterprise, using Catholic property as collateral.

Besides minority groups and labor unions, we have other

pressure groups, from oil-industries to lodges. It seems now generally admitted that those American citizens who do not belong to these pressure groups, no longer have representation in Washington, D. C. If true, this would make the Catholic pressure groups the more dangerous. Columnist David Lawrence summed up the activities of the 85th Congress (Aug. 1958) by quoting a famous journalist who had covered every session, and who calls it a congress of "vote-trading", "log-rolling" and "legislative juggling . . . behind the scenes", "mainly concerned with local projects or the pressure of voting groups, and evidently of the belief that the country as a whole would never find out what really happened" (Aug. 26, 1958). In other words, our Congress, which becomes more and more Catholic, is betraying the citizens whom it should represent.

AL SMITH'S CREED (1927)

In the days of Alfred E. Smith one article of the "Syllabus" was quoted to point out Catholic belief, and the Catholic candidate replied that he had never heard of this document till his opponents mentioned it. He used the old jesuitical method of calling it an old and "obsolete" document, thereby inferring that his opponent was maliciously attacking him without cause. In one breath, Smith first refers to his ignorance to prove one point and then turns 'expert' by declaring it obsolete. Not even Cardinal Spellman has the authority to define Catholic doctrine, or to declare which papal bulls are still infallible and which have become obsolete. Smith further ridiculed the Protestant for thinking that all Catholics are alike. The voter has no time to psychoanalyze every candidate, and certainly has no desire to vote only for 'bad' Catholics. He knows that those who have the support of their hierarchy definitely have obligations towards their church.

Such old standards as "without mental reservation" do not prove the integrity and sincerity of a 'creed'-writing candidate. The candidate is free to stay with his church or to leave it. But as long as the reigning pope refuses to retract the papal bulls of the last centuries and the Jesuits refuse to retract their hate mongering in their "America" magazine, any loyal, non-Catholic citizen naturally refuses to vote a member of such a hate-

organization into power.

"I recognize no power in the institutions of my Church to interfere with the operations of the Constitution of the United States or the enforcement of the law of the land. I believe in absolute freedom of conscience for all men and in equality of all churches, all sects, and all beliefs before the law as a matter of right and not as a matter of favor. I believe in the absolute separation of Church and State . . . I believe that no tribunal of any church has any power to make any decree of any force in the law of the land. . . I believe in the support of the public school as one of the corner stones of American liberty" (*Alfred E. Smith, "Catholic and Patriot," in Atlantic Monthly, April, 1927, vol. 139, p. 728*).

Catholic professor Edmond J. Moore, who wrote a book entitled: "Al Smith runs for President," warned Senator John F. Kennedy in Jan. 1959, not to duplicate Al Smith's mistake of putting his political 'creed' in print. Yet Kennedy did not heed the warning. After he published his creed, the Catholic press mildly rebuked his heresies (*see pages 89-90*) so that after the election no one can have an excuse of not knowing that Kennedy was in error, and may not keep his promises.

JOHN F. KENNEDY'S CREED (1959)

"Whatever one's religion in his private life may be, for the officeholder, nothing takes precedence over his oath to uphold the Constitution and all its parts—including the First Amendment and the strict separation of church and state . . . I believe as a senator that the separation of Church and State is fundamental to our American concept and heritage and should remain so. I am flatly opposed to appointment of an ambassador to the Vatican. Whatever advantages it might have in Rome—and I'm not convinced of these—they would be more than offset by the divisive effect at home. The first Amendment to the Constitution is an infinitely wise one. There can be no question of Federal funds being used for support of parochial or private schools. It's unconstitutional under the First Amendment as interpreted by the Supreme Court. I'm opposed to the Federal Government's extending support to sustain any church or its schools" (*John F. Kennedy; in Look, March 3, 1959; as quoted*

by AP, Feb. 16, 1959).

John Kennedy, like Al Smith, wants the public to believe that he is a 'liberal' Catholic, different from the others. Voters ought to ask a Catholic candidate this question: 'Are you a good Catholic or a bad one?' If he answers 'a good Catholic', we know that he cannot be a good President, for his first allegiance will be to the Pope of Rome. If he answers 'a bad Catholic', we certainly do not want him in the White House. A man without sincerity in matters of religion cannot be trusted in matters of state.

A P P E N D I X

PAPAL EXCOMMUNICATIONS OF SECULAR RULERS

A.D. 1076 Pope Gregory VII excommunicated King Henry IV: "O Blessed Peter . . . by your power and authority I depose King Henry . . . from the government of any and all kingdoms of Germany and Italy . . . and I loose all Christians from the bonds of their oaths which they have taken . . . and I forbid anyone to serve him as King" (*Migne, P.L. 148, 74; Liber Pont. 2, 283*).

A.D. 1209 Pope Innocent III excommunicated King John of England and in 1212 the pope declared the English king deposed and asked King Philip of France to invade the British Isles unless the English king surrendered his kingdom to Rome and agreed to govern it as a papal fief. The sentence of excommunication included the eternal damnation of his entire family: "His sentence is absolutely irrevocable . . . His viper progeny included" (*Milman H.H., Hist. of Latin Christ.*, vol. 5, p. 487).

A.D. 1215 Pope Innocent III excommunicated the English Barons (*Thomas Rymer, Foedera, vol. 1, part 1, p. 69*), and condemned the Magna Charta which demanded separation of pope and state: "That the Church of England shall be free and have her whole rights and her liberties inviolable" (*Art. 1; Mirbt, No. 314*).

A.D. 1239 Pope Gregory IX, who constantly excommunicated Frederick II, beginning with *Coena Domini*, March 21, 1228 (*Bullarium, vol. 3, p. 429*), incited assassination by placing the whole world under interdict, i.e., depriving it from the sacraments of salvation: "We have placed under ecclesiastical interdict the cities, camps, homes, and other places where he may be found, as long as he stays there" (*Bullarium III, 499*).

A.D. 1303 Pope Boniface VIII, as recorded by contemporary historians, "sought to oppress the King of France with excommunications and by other means in order to deprive him of the kingdom" (*Villani, bk 8, chapt. 63; Muratori, R.I.S., 13, 395*).

A.D. 1535 Pope Paul III excommunicated King Henry VIII of England: "We proclaim . . . that King Henry has incurred the penalty of deprivation of his kingdom . . . that he must be deprived of church burial and We smite them with the sword of anathema, malediction and eternal damnation . . . And let the sons of King Henry . . . share the punishment . . . And We absolve and totally release from their oath of allegiance all the subjects of the same King Henry" (*Bull "Ejus qui immobilis," Bullarium, Turin ed., vol. 6, p. 195*).

A.D. 1570 Pope Pius V excommunicated Queen Elizabeth of England: "He that reigns in the highest . . . entrusted the government of the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church, outside of which there is no salvation, to one man alone . . . the Roman Pontiff. . . This one man He set up as Chief over all nations and all kingdoms, to seize, destroy, scatter, dispose . . . We declare the aforesaid Elizabeth, being a heretic and a supporter of heretics, and her adherents in this matter, to have incurred the sentence of anathema . . . and all others who have taken an oath of any kind to her We declare to be absolved forever from such an oath and from all duty of dominion, fidelity and obedience" (*Bull "Regnans in excelsis," Bullarium 7, 810*).

Not only secular rulers, but also religious leaders like John Hus, John Wycliff, Martin Luther, etc., were subjected to papal excommunications and to the vilest curses. Every local bishop claims similar powers, even the right to impose eternal hell fire on innocent relatives. The Archbishop of Santa Fe, N. M., excommunicates girls participating in beauty contests: "Yesterday the office of the archbishop affirmed that Miss Ingersoll and her family would be deprived of the sacraments . . . if she parades publicly in a bathing suit" (AP July 4, '59). A church which never excommunicated a murderer like Hitler, never abolished legalized prostitution in Catholic Spain, never excommunicated the 80,000 unionized prostitutes of Chicago, will excommunicate innocent relatives and innocent bystanders in order to obtain its selfish ends. We cannot afford to allow an American president to become subject to the papal system of excommunications.

"No people in history who have lost their freedom ever deliberately and knowingly voted its abandonment. In every case it was taken by conquest or stealth"—J. C. Fenney (New Age mag., July, 1957).

"Our liberties are safe . . . until legislators have resigned their functions to ecclesiastical power and their prerogatives to priests"—President Wilson.

"Keep the Church and State separate"—President Ulysses S. Grant.

"From the beginning of the war there has been, not a secret, but a public alliance between the Pope of Rome and Jefferson Davis . . . The Jesuits are so expert in their deeds of blood"—President Abraham Lincoln.

"I do not like the reappearance of the Jesuits . . . Their restoration is indeed a step towards darkness, cruelty, perfidy, despotism, death"—President John Adams.

"If the United States ever loses her liberty, it will be through the Romish priesthood"—President George Washington.

The Jesuits should be "suppressed, extinguished, abolished and abrogated FOREVER"—Pope Clement XIV.

"And thus I hide my naked villainy,
With old, odd ends, stolen forth of Holy Writ,
And seem a saint, when I play the Devil"—William Shakespeare.
(King Richard III, Act 1, scene 3)

"No Italian priest shall tithe or toll in our Dominions . . .
So tell the pope . . . and his usurped authority"—William Shakespeare.
(King John, Act 3, scene 1)

"Rome, subdued she is a Lamb,
Treated as an equal she is a Fox
When in power she is a hungry Lion."

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

of original sources, with at least one library where books may be found.

Acta Sanctae Sedis; a monthly and continuation of the *Bullarium Romanum*. Rome, 1865 — (Berkeley, Calif.)

Baronius, Caesar, d. 1607 (the "Venerable" Italian Cardinal)
Annales Ecclesiastici, Lucca, 1774. 38 folio vols. (Newberry Library, Chicago; and in nearly all State universities)

St. Bridget (Birgitta of Sweden), d. 1373 (Prophetess and Saint) *Revelationes*, Nuremberg, 1500. (Newberry Library, Chicago)

Bullarium Romanum, Rome, 1733-1857; Turin edition, 1857-1885. 51 vols. (in Berkeley; Newberry; Iowa City; Urbana; etc.)

Burchard, Bishop John, d. 1506 (Pontifical biographer)
Diarium, Paris, 1885. 3 vols. (Newberry; Madison, Wis.)

Dupuy, Pierre, d. 1651, ed. (Paris. National Library. Dept. of Manuscripts) *Preuves de l'Histoire du differend de Boniface et Philippe le Bel*, 683 p.; bound with *Histoire du differend . . .* Paris, 1655. (Minneapolis; Newberry; Chicago Univ.)

Hefele, Bishop Carl Joseph von (greatest scholar on the councils and speaker at Vatican Council, 1870) *Conciliengeschichte*. Freiburg, 1890. 9 vols. (Urbana, Ill.)

Huillard-Breholles, J. L. Alphonse, d. 1871, ed. *Historia diplomatica Frederici Secundi*, Paris, 1852. 11 vols. (Newberry Library; Univ. of Chicago)

Liber Pontificalis, ed. by Msgr. Louis M. O. Duchesne, d. 1922; Paris, 1892. 2 folio vols. (Newberry; Univ. of Chicago)

Mansi, John Dominic, d. 1769, ed. (Italian Archbishop)
Sacrorum Conciliorum Collectio, Florence, Venice, 1758-1798; extended to 58 folio volumes. (Marquette; Urbana; U.S.C.; etc.)

Migne, Jack Paul, d. 1875, ed. (French priest-scholar)
Patrologiae Latinae and *Patrologiae Graecae cursus*, Paris, 1844-1857. 473 volumes. (New York Public Library; Union Theol. Sem.; Philadelphia; Washington, D. C.; Univ. of Chicago; Newberry; Milwaukee; Madison, Wis.; Urbana, Ill.; Iowa City; Minneapolis; Lincoln, Neb.; USC and UCLA in Los Angeles; Berkeley, Calif.; etc.)

Mirbt, Carl Theodor, b. 1860 (Lutheran prof. of church hist.)
Quellen zur geschichte des Papstthums und des romische Katholizismus, Leipzig, 1895, Tübingen, 1935 (UCLA and Berkely, Calif.)

Monumenta Germaniae Historica, ed. by Pertz, etc.: *Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum*, Hanover, 1894, 42 vols.; *Leges*, and other collections, totalling 127 vols. (USC Los Angeles)

Muratori, Louis Anthony, d. 1750, ed. (Italian priest-scholar)
Rerum Italicarum Scriptores, Milan 1751. 31 folio vols.
Annali d'Italia, Milan, 1744-1749. 12 folio vols.
Antiquitates Italicae Medii Aevi, Milan, 1742. 8 folio vols. (Newberry; USC)

Rymer, Thomas, 1641-1713, ed. (Gt. Britain. Manuscripts)
Foedera, conventiones, litterae et . . . acta publica inter reges Angliae et alios; London, 3rd ed. 1745, 40 folio volumes (UCLA)

Thomas Aquinas, d. 1274 "Summa Theologica" (English text)
London, 1928. 22 vols. (in nearly all universities)